

JÜRGEN HANNEDER

ABHINAVAGUPTA'S
PHILOSOPHY OF REVELATION
MĀLINĪŚLOKAVĀRTTIKA I, 1-399



EGBERT FORSTEN

GRONINGEN ORIENTAL STUDIES
VOLUME XIV

Published under the auspices of the J. Gonda Foundation
Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences

Editor

H. T. Bakker, *Groningen*

Editorial Board

H. W. Bodewitz · D. D. S. Goodall

H. Isaacson · G. J. Meulenbeld

Advisory Board

C. Caillat, *Paris* · R. E. Emmerick, *Hamburg*

J. Ensink, *Groningen* · R. F. Gombrich, *Oxford*

J. C. Heesterman, *Leiden* · D. Shulman, *Jerusalem*

Ch. Vaudeville, *Paris* · J. Williams, *Berkeley*

Abhinavagupta's
Philosophy of Revelation

An edition and annotated translation of

Mālinīlokacārtika I, 1-399

Jürgen Hanneder



EGBERT FORSTEN · GRONINGEN

1998

1. P. ... Siva. Pancavaktra Temple. Mandi.
Himachal Pradesh, 14th Century AD

The book was printed with financial support from the
J. Gonda Foundation, Amsterdam.

ms. 9069801167



This book meets the requirements of ISO 9706:1994
Information and documentation
Paper for documents-requirements for permanence

Copyright © 1998 Egbert Forsten, Groningen, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system,
transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying,
recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

Preface

The present work is an attempt to edit and translate the first part of the *Maitri
ślokaśrīṭika*, which deals with the origin of the Śaiva revelation. This text is,
as its name indicates, a versified commentary on the *Mālinīvijayottaraṭantra*
and was composed by the Kashmirian philosopher Abhinavagupta, whose lit-
erary activity must have centred around the end of the 10th and the beginning
of the 11th century AD. It is written in a style which sometimes looks simple,
but never is, and the high degree of abstraction it displays combines with the
bad state of the transmitted text to present a formidable task to every reader. As
this case proves, only initial naivety and the commitment to finishing a degree
in a predetermined time can persuade one to pursue such a work. Even if it is
not stated at every other verse, my interpretation cannot be anything but provi-
sional. Nevertheless it is, I think, useful to make this attempt, because the text
is important for further studies of Abhinavagupta's concept of the Śaiva canon.

The greater part of this work was completed during a one and a half year stay
in Oxford, where I had the opportunity to discuss approximately half of my edi-
tion and translation as well as many issues relating to the interpretation of this
text with Professor Alexis Sanderson of All Souls College. He very generously
made available to me some of his unpublished articles and drew my attention
to many of the sources utilized in this thesis; it is no exaggeration to say that
without his guidance this work would have been impossible.

I also wish to thank Professor Michael Hahn to whom I owe most of my
philological training in Sanskrit and who took upon himself the supervision of
this doctorate. His unfailing support in every stage was crucial to the comple-
tion of this thesis.

For creating the lively and stimulating atmosphere in Oxford I would like
to thank my fellow students, especially my colleague and friend Dr. Dominic
Goodall, not only for numerous discussions on Śaiva matters, but also for proof-
reading and improving the English. Dr. Harunaga Isaacson, especially for his
close inspection of my edition, and Somdev Vasudeva for his comments, fur-
thermore, in chronological order, Dr. Johannes Schneider (Berlin), Dr. Jayandra
Soni (Marburg), Dr. Perī Śarveśhvāra Sharma (Marburg) and Prof. Walter Slaje

I am indebted to Mr. M. A. ... of whom contributed to this work through ...
I also thank Prof. Raffaele Torella, who was the external super-
visor for the thesis, and who provided me with a substantial list of cor-
rections that helped a great deal to improve the present edition.
I would also like to thank B. P. Sharma, Jammu, who has been so kind as to
send me with copies of the two manuscripts, to the Niedersächsische Staats-
bibliothek, Göttingen, and the Bodleian Library, Oxford, for
permitting me their manuscripts for the present publication.

Contents

PART 1 INTRODUCTION	1
1 The Śaiva Revelation	3
1.1 The Validity of Non-vedic Revelation	8
1.2 Śiva's 'Body'	11
1.3 The Structure of the Śaiva Canon	17
1.4 Models of Integration	19
1.5 Abhinavagupta's Definition of Āgama	23
1.6 The Threefold Division	26
1.7 <i>Tantrālokaviveka</i> 1.18	28
2 The <i>Mālinīślokaśrīrīti</i>	33
3 The Text of the <i>Mālinīślokaśrīrīti</i>	38
3.1 The Names of the Text	38
3.2 Editions and Manuscripts	39
3.3 Description of the Manuscripts	42
3.4 Textual Criticism	45
3.5 Stylistic Peculiarities	52
3.6 Notes on the Translation and the Commentary	55
3.7 Abbreviations Used in the Edition	55
PART 2 TEXT AND TRANSLATION	57
PART 3 COMMENTARY	125
1 Introductory Verses	127
2 The <i>Mūlasūtra</i>	139
3 The Nature of Knowledge	141

xviii	Contents	
4	The Trika	143
4.1	Śāstra as the Knowledge Inherent in Consciousness	147
5	The Five Powers	157
5.1	The Nature of Time	159
5.2	Light as Knowledge	161
5.3	The Nature of the Light of Consciousness	163
5.4	The Number of Powers	169
5.5	The Transcendence of Purity	172
6	The Five Streams of the Śāstra	184
6.1	Kula	184
6.2	Time	185
6.3	The Sixth Stream	190
6.4	Trika Defined as "Half of Six"	192
6.5	The Five Faces of Sadāśiva	195
6.6	Īśāna	196
6.7	Tatpuruṣa	205
6.8	Sadyojāta	206
6.9	Sadyojāta (continued)	210
6.10	Vāmadeva	213
6.11	Aghora	218
7	The Three Divisions of the Śāstra	228
	APPENDICES	235
	Appendix 1 The <i>Śrīkaṇṭhī</i>	237
1.1	Summary of Contents	238
	Appendix 2 Verse Index	269
	Appendix 3 Bibliography	287

Part I

Introduction

Chapter 1 The Śaiva Revelation

The first part of the *Mañiśślokaivārttika*¹ deals with the origin of the five streams (*pañcasrotas*) of Śaiva revelation (*śaivaśāstra*),² that is, with the divisions and hierarchies of the texts taught by Śiva. In order to understand the position of this religion in what we are used to call Hinduism, as well as the context of the *Vārttika*, some preliminary considerations may prove useful.

Since the term "Hinduism" as a modern creation is not considered sufficient for the description of Indian religions in a historical perspective, a distinction between Vedism or Vedic religion, Vaiṣṇavism and Śaivism is sometimes adopted in textbooks on "Hinduism". The first term is unfortunately confusing, for the word "Vedic" is used by medieval Indian exegetes not as a historical term, but as denoting one, namely the orthodox,³ segment of Indian religions. One of the main criteria that defined the position of "sects" or "religions" in India was their position relative to orthopraxy, i.e. to the "vedic" religion. Acceptance of it was demonstrated through the practice of a social religion based on exegesis of a twofold canon of scriptures: "vedic" literature (*śruti*) and the more elastic category of *smṛti*. Because of their abandonment of orthopraxy – for instance through rejecting caste – certain religious groups, like the Buddhists or Jains, were considered to be "un-vedic" (*vedabhāva*). For the orthodox, even Śaivas and Pāścātrīkas were *vedabhāva* – and therefore not fundamentally different from the Buddhist – as they based their system on scriptures that were revealed by Śiva or Viṣṇu and disputed the authority

¹ See 3.1. for the names of this text and Appendix 3 for the abbreviations used.

² The term *śāstra* is sometimes used in the singular to describe "scripture" itself. Despite the fact that oral traditions play a great role in Indian literature, I am using the word "scripture", since on the lowest level of revelation the *śāstra* is a written document, even if it is supposed to be learnt by heart.

³ I have usually followed the convention to use "orthopraxy" instead of "orthodoxy" in order to emphasize that not so much belief in, but practice of a specific cult is the defining characteristic; nevertheless I do not feel complicit to coin a new adjective.

Thus, namely by control of and with people of lower castes and by eating and drinking impure substances. Forthwith the esoteric Tantric Śaivas this insistence on purity was not only ultimately invalid, but also the very cause for bondage and the need to be transcended. Again, these are distinctions that enable us to understand the mechanism of mutual adaptation and rejection; in reality we may not even find two completely separate and mutually opposing systems of worship, namely Vaidika and Tantrika, at any time in history, but a variety of compromises. It works, for instance, ²¹ the Kaula injunction to offer and drink alcohol at the daily ritual we can see, even in our author's time, different approaches and reactions: on the one hand the Kaula attitude itself, according to which the status of the practitioner depends on the consumption of alcohol, just as the status of the orthodox on the avoidance of it; then a form of compromise, in which water is substituted for alcohol, and finally the rejection of this watered-down practice by the Kaulas themselves. In other words, we might, on the level of theoretical discourse, always find the whole spectrum between ortho- and heteropraxy, mutual adaptation and rejection.²²

1.1 The Validity of Non-vedic Revelation

We saw that the defining characteristic of Tantric Śaivism was a canon of scriptures that was different from Vedic revelation (*śruti*) and from the group of secondary scriptures (*smṛti*). The texts in this canon were called Tantras, with the connotation of providing the highest authority, Āgamas. Just as

P. 96 || *ed bahya, prapannasiddhismakṛmīṇā bhagavadāśrāddhanīrthataḥ* || *dhṛṣṭi-*
śāntam āśrāddhamānāśrāddhikāram ||, *Āgamaśrīrāmānīya*, p. 105. Similarly in the case
 of Śrīrāmānīya *ed* *śāntam āśrāddhamānāśrāddhikāram* || *bahāḥ || kalpanīya āśramādi-*
śāntam āśrāddhamānāśrāddhikāram ||, *Āgamaśrīrāmānīya*, p. 96.
 = 42–45

[illegible]

the claim to superiority was inherent in the self-description of the dualistic system as Siddhānta,²⁴ i.e. "valid doctrine", or "the definite answer to all other systems",²⁵ the word *Āgama* suggested that texts that were revealed by Śiva could claim highest authority. The definition of the word *āgama* or *śahita* in spoken by Śiva, Viṣṇu, Śūrya etc.

Despite all considerations of hierarchy within the Śaiva revelation and attacks on the dualistic Siddhānta, Tantric Śaivism as a whole had to assert its validity against Vedic orthodoxy and we fortunately have a witness of this process only one century before Abhinavagupta. The Kashmirian logician Jayanta Bhaṭṭa deals with the validity of non-vedic revelations in two of his works, the *Myśramanījorī* (śhnikā 4, āgamapratyāyamanipātana) and the *Āgaminidāna*.²¹ Jayanta Bhaṭṭa was in favour of an acceptance of the Śaiva Agamas, but describes several hypothetical positions with regard to the validity of different Agamas, including those of the Buddhists, to reach the least compromising position that demands congruence to the Veda for any scripture to be valid and therefore excludes Buddhist scripture does not reject the Śaivāgamas:

²⁹But the scriptures other [than Śruti and Smṛiti] that are thought to be valid,²⁸ of which we know (*vān paridṛśyate*), are of two kinds: some proceed in complete contradiction to the Veda – like those of the Buddhists etc. – others through teaching rites that are formed without contradiction to it²⁹ – like those taught by Śiva etc. Among these we teach the validity of the Śaiva scriptures [for the following reasons:] we do not perceive the many defilements that are the cause for doubt and contradiction in the knowledge created by it; it is proved by the Smṛti and inference that they too were created by God; it is impossible to imagine another cause [for them] like greed, delusion etc.; [...] and they do not exist in opposition to the Veda, because they do not discard the activities [peculiar] to the four

²⁴ *sahihānna'abehiḥ pañcujāḍṣabehunil sugurūḥyā sūvpraññeṣu kāmikādīsū dāvājada rasi tanneṣu pruvīdilhah, Ratnatrayavallakha 10–12.*

²⁶ According to the *Nyāyasūtra* 1.1.7: *ūpapadaśah sambudh*.

27 For a detailed discussion of Jayanta's position, see WEZLER (1976).

29 At the moment I see no other possibility than to construe *kāpinu-* with the preceding *m-*.

29 At the moment I see no other possibility than to construe *kalpanā* with the preceding instrumental. One could also consider emending to *kalpavratānāmupadeśīnā* and construe the

instrumental advertently.

the treatment of the *pāṇisvaras* in the *Wṛttika*. The *Śvacchandanatantra* describes it as follows: according to 11.33–36 the transcendental Śiva is completely pure and omnipresent like space. Beneath this formless and all-pervading Śiva are other deities with a limited 'pervasiveness', which means that they are situated lower in the hierarchy of the *tantras*. They pervade all levels below them, but are pervaded by Śiva. These 'causal deities' (*kāraṇadevatā*) are then described:

"But now I will summarily teach how far the 'cause' [deities] pervade [the universe].⁴⁷ Brahmā is presiding over the element earth, Viṣṇu over the element water, Rudra over fire, Īśvara over air and Sadāśiva over space.⁴⁸

Kṣemarāja adds that a similar identification can be made with the five *kalās*.⁴⁸ and the text supplies a further set of identifications that are not relevant here. Then, in verses 40d–41, the five *kāṇḍeśvaras* are correlated to the five *brahmans*, and in vs. 42 the four horizontal faces (i.e. except the Īśāna face which is directed upwards) with the four Vedas, so that the following picture emerges:

<i>direction</i>	<i>brahma/face</i>	<i>kāmya</i>	<i>scripture</i>
west	Sadyojāta	Brahmā	R̥gveda
north	Vāmadeva	Viṣṇu	Yajurveda
south	Aghora	Rudra	Sāmaveda
east	Tai purusa	Īśvara	Atharva
zenith	Īśāna	Sadāśiva	*sarvavidyānaka*

This is followed by another set of identifications with the same names for the faces.

As a supplementary Kesemajärvi adds a note that here only the lower form of these 'causing' verbs is described and that another is found earlier in the text which had started with *hän* 'he' and has therefore six instead of five – is therefore not contradicted. Since these can be understood as attempts to resolve inconsistencies which in reality are created by careless, or hesitant reduction of the text and one might hope to unravel the reductional history of these texts by analysing these statements; cf. ARRAI (1988). But the assumption of a coherent archetype may be futile: a specific Tantra may have always existed as a compilation of authoritative, but possibly conflicting accounts of Śaiva theory and practice.

Sadyojāta	<i>hantakam rajiniman</i>
Vāmadeva	<i>rudhikan</i>
Aghora	<i>adhyātmanikan</i>
Tatparusa	<i>atmanirgākhyam</i>
Isāna	<i>manirākhyam</i>

We will see that the *mantramāṅga* (*mantrāṅgha*) is again divided into five parts, but the text gives no clue as to how we are to understand the relationship between these sets of five faces. Are they to be identified, so that, for instance, the same *Sadyojīta* is the source for the *Rgveda* and for 'worldly knowledge'? In some sense this may be correct, because the fivefold structure remains the basis of diversity and further multiplication would surely be seen as an internal differentiation, but on the other hand one has to conclude that the two sets of five faces form a hierarchy: the *śāṅa* in our first list was described as 'consisting of all knowledge' (*sarvavidyāśāṅa*),⁵⁴ which can only be explained as 'summary of the next set'. In the case of the next *śāṅa*, who is said to be the source of the *mantramāṅga* (*mantrāṅgha*), the same principle must be applied, for the *mantramāṅga* falls into five groups that are again associated to *Sadyojīta* etc. As far as I could see, none of the sources preceding Abhinavagupta specify how many sets of five faces are to be assumed for the explanation of scripture, and our author uses the doctrine of a further subdivision of the five more to hint at an infinite variety of scriptures, rather than to formulate a doctrine of more than five 'streams'. But some later sources proceeded further in this direction by determining the number of 'streams' as twenty-five, i.e. five-fold faces.

The issue of a hierarchy of faces is further complicated by iconographical considerations. Śaṅkarā is depicted as five-headed in sculpture and painting, but the fifth face, *śāṇa*, often remains invisible,⁵¹ which means that the highest and more pervasive may be indicated by a lack of form. There may not be a hard and fast rule for sculptors in this matter, but this suggests that the doctrinal background of a specific number of heads may be difficult to determine. If we were to construct an image that would arrange the hierarchy of faces and corresponding doctrines in the *Śvecchra* passage quoted above, we would not be able to take the change of perspectives into account: viewed from below the first *śāṇa* would be a single head as the source of 'all knowledge' (*svayīdātmānir*); from above the same *śāṇa* would not be *one* face, but five. The resulting image with two tiers of faces would ideally have ten faces, but in fact only nine could be

⁵¹ See KREISEL (1986) p. 64, fn. 204) and SHARMA (1976).

encom → all forms of $\bar{\bar{e}}$ →

... *ariza*, the upper, fifth face is
... then the only one mentioned. The
are named the same way according to the position
... their respective names, the con-
... are the following⁶

- *the tantra*
- *heretic*
- *kinds of poison*
- *magical control over everything*
- *spirits and planetary influence*
- *chemistry*

the southern face is called *vāma* in the sense of "right" <cf. "*dakṣiṇa-tantra*" is therefore
- We shall now deal here with the names of the
- to the *Vārtika*.⁶

...see that whereas the four lower faces are directed towards temporary results with which a person must identify, the upper face is reserved for the permanent result. The interested view that the dualist is in error is correct, but could only do so with the aid of the *śāstra* provided them with the necessary exegetical

[illegible]

1. The Sauria Rev. 24.5

literature. Their problem was that these "higher" scripture were associated with the faces of Viṣṇuśaṅkara and Aghora. This is an important line of argumentation in the *Vārttika* serves to explain why the Siddhānta that came out of the upper face is not the highest doctrine.

There are many later accounts of the same process, for instance in the first chapter of the *Kāṇḍikāgama*, but it may be enough to quote a passage from the *śāstraśāstraśāstra*, a voluminous encyclopedia that has a slightly naive, but very accurate characterization of the two less important 'streams', namely the eastern and western term.¹²

¹But the [the Īkṣa face] are four streams. Through them were created Tattva, these are taken separately the Gāruda, the Dakṣiṇa, Vāma- and Bhṛāntanas.

Of these it is said that in the *Gāruḍatantra* one should perform worship of the mantra of *Tatpuruṣa* and meditate on it in a particular way.¹⁰⁶ This *Tantra* teaches particularly and clearly Mantras and herbs for the cure of poisons, like that of snakes etc.

in the *Daśagāṇṭha* one should meditate on and perform worship of the
 mantra of Aghora and it is taught that it alone is to be realized. Mantras
 and their applications are taught there which bring victory over enemies
 in the *Bhīṣatāntra* the might of [the mantra of] *Sadyojāta* is told as well
 as mantras and herbs for the pacification of ghosts, spirits, goblins in the
 ...¹⁴

1.4 Models of Integration

And must have concerned the theologians that advocated the worship of more orthodox pantheons was the fact that the pan-Śaiva model of revelation with its five streams favoured the Siddhānta. In order to achieve an integration of other

¹¹ "Maybe one should rather meditate through *śreṣṭha*, i.e. Garuḍa."

[illegible]

uh... sam iti kirtate tantrendanena karpide. namre tu chetane mantrani

prokure, i.e. ena parispulam tante tu dāc. v. p. h. ram. b. par. h. a.
pū. a. ? a tad e. a. i. a. m d. d. i. s. t. r. a. m u. s. t. a. m u. l. t. h. u. r. a. m n. i. h. i. l.

1. m. *huyang* *officinalis* *mongolica* *var.* *mongolica*

1. *m. bhutapret-pisicadulini* in *mantrasadhami* . . . *bhutapret*
- 188, 189-195

in which the main deity of this system can be worshipped;⁸⁰ the next chapter starts with the request by the goddess that Śiva may specify one point right before, namely how it is that the worship of forms of the deity taught in these scriptures – the Vāma, Dakṣiṇa and Siddhānta, but also Saura, Vaiṣṇava and Vaidika – can be chosen at will and lead to the desired fruit. The answer is of course that the deity of the Tantra, Amṛteśabhairava, is all-pervading, consists of all the Āgamas and therefore bestows the fruit of all mantras. He takes on the form of Sadāśiva to bestow the fruit of the worship onto the worshipper (9.16cd–17ab), etc. This inclusivism is then specified through a description of some of these pantheons. In chapter 9 a description of Sadāśiva is given, chapter 10 is a description of Bhairava as worshipped according to the scriptures of the southern stream.

Tumburu's pantheon,⁸¹ which is described in chapter 11, is noteworthy, first because there are not many sources for the Vāmasrotas and, furthermore, because it supplies some parallels to the *Vārṇika*. Kṣemarāja's verse that introduces this chapter uses the key words *sambhāgva* and *raṇana* that will mark the description of Vānadeva in the *Vārṇika*. Verse 1 of chapter 11 mentions that his Tantra grants all "the fruit of all *siddhis*", an expression which occurs also in 185b. It then goes on to describe the installation of the three-armed, five-faced and three-eyed Tumburu in an eight-petaled lotus. The deity's face should be designed according to the method followed for creating the form of Sadāśiva, and who is surrounded by his four powers: Vajra, Varuṇa, Jvaṇa (Agni) and Aparājita.

The background for Abhinava's treatment of the left stream in the *Vārṇika*⁸² is the notion that this stream is concerned with magical power (*siddhi*) and is especially with rites for sexual attraction. Interestingly this connection between Tumburu and "desire" emerges from a passage in the *Yogarāśyīha*.⁸³ Kṣemarāja's narrative provides external evidence not only for the connection of Tumburu with the left current, but also for his association with the deity of the right current, which is one of the features of the Trika's theory of the

of pantheons in the *Netraṭantra* continues in chapter 12 with the pantheon formed by the eight mothers. Kṣemarāja's introduction repro-

⁸⁰ Prasad, 1974, for a summary.

⁸¹ Prasad, 1985, p. 19–62 for a collection of material on and detailed analysis.

⁸² Prasad, 1985, p. 186 (fn. 90) and p. 212–214.

⁸³ Prasad, 1985, p. 162, translates it as "correct a person."

duces the doctrine that the Kula is the undivided essence of the preceding systems, i.e. Siddhānta, Dakṣiṇa and Vāma, but the Tantra itself does not confirm the position of the Kaula, as its inclusivism extends, in chapter 13, to a description of Nārāyaṇa and Śūrya.⁸⁴ This explains why the *Netraṭantra*, despite a 1 parallel, is ignored by Abhinavagupta in the context of the description of the canon; this Tantra is aware of the Vāma, Dakṣiṇa, Trika (13.37–43) and Kaula, but includes them merely as possible forms of the worship of Netraṭāṭa. In other words, it is for Abhinavagupta too near to the truth of the Trika, but too far from his sectarian position.

1.5 Abhinavagupta's Definition of Āgama

In the first chapters of his *Tantrāloka*, Abhinavagupta expounds aspects of his philosophy of Saiva revelation. Āṭika 35 deals with the "unity of all Śāstras" (vs. 1) as taught by his teacher Sambhunātha (vs. 44). The author starts by defining *śāstra* as the basic knowledge (*prasaṁdita*) on which every long established activity (*svavahāra*) depends,⁸⁵ and which is a perception that expresses itself into sound, i.e. words (19a). Without such prior knowledge even direct perception – would not be able to select eatables. So it is that without being aware of it everyone depends on the primary *āgama* that has its source in Śiva. In a parallel in the *Tantrāsāra*⁸⁶ he adds that, fundamentally, the Śāstras were not divided according to the variety of desired results and the diversity of qualifications (*adhikāra*), but through Śiva's power of limitation people became devoted only to parts of this Ur-Āgama: some to the Veda, where duality predominates; some to the Sāṃkhya or to the Vaiṣṇava scriptures in their fruitless search for liberation; some who hold that the nature of Śiva is separate from the world in the Saiva-Siddhānta; some who teach the highest deity as omniform in the *Mahāgāyātrī*; and very few to the Trika. In this way Śiva leads every soul gradually to the "one fruit", i.e. true liberation, which is that of the Trika.

⁸⁴ Prasad, 1985, p. 43, quotes this Tantra for a division into three streams, but this is Kṣemarāja's interpretation.

⁸⁵ The key term *prasaṁdita*, which is, in the same context, used in its primary sense "known" by Jayanta Bhaṭṭa (*śaṅkhaśāstra*: *prasaṁdita* *prajñā*, *āgama*, *śāstra*, *śāstra*, *śāstra*, p. 628), is here reinterpreted. The *Śaṅkhaśāstra* gives *prajñā* and *śāstra* as synonyms, (Skt. 1.1.1972), p. 162, translates it as "correct a person."

⁸⁶ See chapter 21, p. 193–4.

As a way of fragmentation this *prasaiddha* spreads either as an unbroken chain of teacher and disciple (*gaurāṅpurā*), or as scripture (TĀ 35.15).⁸⁶ Although there is only one Āgama, it becomes manifold through its division into different parts, like the four arms of man, but this does not imply internal contradiction (28), and does not falsify its validity. There is, however, a clear hierarchy of these parts so that the higher fruit cannot be attained through the lower doctrines and practices: the adherents, for instance, of the Pañcarātra can only experience what they think to be liberation, whereas true liberation through identity with Śiva is beyond them (29). Thus the whole range of knowledge, starting from worldly knowledge, and including all forms of religion, culminates in the Trīka, but the unity of all knowledge can be seen only on the Kula level of the Trīka, since the Kula is the essence of all Śāstras (30–34).

Having propounded the descent and abridgment of the original Śāstra in Abhinīka 36, he draws the conclusion that the lower doctrines, like that of the Veda, are dominated by delusion in order to preserve the world:

Since [the lower systems] have perceived a part of the reality of the higher doctrine, but rejected it, we see the nature of delusion in these lower systems, because it protects creation. For instance in the holy Ānandaśāstra it is taught by Śiva that the word of the Ṛsis [is the cause of] much trouble, produces uncertain and minor result [and is therefore] limited: the wise should not take it as an authority, but resort only to the scripture of Śiva.⁸⁷

But this is not all: for the same reason, i.e. because the Veda is in the domain of delusion, all that goes against it will lead one beyond delusion: "Those very acts that are the cause of sin in the Veda produce rapid result in this doctrine of the left."⁸⁸ According to SANDERSON *vānaśāsa* here means the doctrine of the Vama-srotas, as the *Ānandatantra* which is quoted here, belongs to that part of the canon,⁸⁹ and it seems that Abhinavagupta wishes to extend this to

the whole Śaiva revelation by following the more general definition of *vāna* as *saṁśāra-viparīṭha*.⁹⁰

The author continues by dividing the doctrine taught by Śiva into two branches, one transmitted by Śrīkaṇṭha (Tantric Śaivism), the other by Lakuleśvara (Pāśupata-Śaivism) (14). Whereas both grant liberation, only the former has also the capability to grant "enjoyment". The doctrine of Śrīkaṇṭha is fivefold, because of the five powers of Śiva, and is called the "fivefold stream" (16). It falls into three parts, a group of ten and one of eighteen scriptures, and above it are the sixty-four Tantras of the "Bhairava division". In verses 18–24 the system of Pīṭhas is introduced. According to this classification the *Mālinī-jyōtīrā* is the "supreme essence of the *Siddhayaogīśvaranāṭam*", which is the main scripture of the highest Pīṭha, the Vidyā-Pīṭha. As further support for the supremacy of the *Mālinītantra* he quotes a few verses that introduce another model of explanation which will be used in the *Varṇika*, namely that the essence of all Tantras fused with the left and the right stream is to be found in the Kaula level of the Trīka. For that reason the Trīka is called "half of six" (*śaḍardha*), because its constituent parts are the following three: the sixth stream above Kāna, i.e. the *ārdhvardha*, the left and the right.⁹¹

It was difficult for the Śaiva Tantrics to be too selective in their choice of individual Tantras as valid, since divine authorship could hardly be rejected in some cases and accepted in others without weakening one's position. One criterion for the validity of the "Āgamas" as a group was their freedom from contradiction (*ekavikyaṁ*), because otherwise divine authorship would be difficult to uphold. It was therefore crucial that the theoreticians produced an account of the Śaiva canon that would declare all parts as valid, but hierarchize them in a way which would support the claim of one's own group for the highest level. On the level of the scriptures themselves this was done by inserting lists of Tantras into the chapters that deal with the "descent" of the scripture (*tantrāvatāra*).⁹² On the level of exegesis it had to be shown that the hierarchy of possibly conflicting Śāstras was logical and intended by Śiva. The Siddhāntikas had no difficulties in showing that their scriptures – which were associated with the highest face of Śiva – were superior,⁹³ but the monists who based their philosophy not on the Siddhāntatantras had to find a model to explain why their own Śāstras repre-

⁸⁶ See, e.g., *Śaiva-sūtra*, p. 86, which refers to Śrīkaṇṭha, vs. 264.

⁸⁷ See, e.g., *Śaiva-sūtra*, p. 86, which refers to Śrīkaṇṭha, vs. 264.

⁸⁸ See, e.g., *Śaiva-sūtra*, p. 86, which refers to Śrīkaṇṭha, vs. 264.

⁸⁹ See, e.g., *Śaiva-sūtra*, p. 86, which refers to Śrīkaṇṭha, vs. 264.

⁹⁰ See, e.g., *Śaiva-sūtra*, p. 86, which refers to Śrīkaṇṭha, vs. 264.

⁹¹ See, e.g., *Śaiva-sūtra*, p. 86, which refers to Śrīkaṇṭha, vs. 264.

⁹² See, e.g., *Śaiva-sūtra*, p. 86, which refers to Śrīkaṇṭha, vs. 264.

⁹³ See, e.g., *Śaiva-sūtra*, p. 86, which refers to Śrīkaṇṭha, vs. 264.

and Sadyojita. S. are about to appear and, in other words, whether they have appeared. No. 4. There are therefore, in scriptural terms, single face. There is one scriptura when all three appear together. When there is three form groups, in No. 5. 14. Tatpurusa, Sadyojita and Sadyojita-Tatpurusa, three scriptura appear. No. 6. There are the ten scriptura of Siva in which unity is predominant. They have been taught in the form of a line.

Scriptura of M.V. 172-173.

Two, fifteen, Vimala, Rudra appear in Agni. Among these three faces, Vimala is V. and Agni is A. That means that, in the former, two faces are formed through Vimala. No. 1. and Agni is No. 2. alone. The result of the taking in, these two, that although there are five faces, three faces, namely, 14, Tatpurusa, and Sadyojita, have been taught in the scriptura of Siva, and a repetition of things taught before is not appropriate. 173. Tatpurusa and Sadyojita, in nature they, being continuous and four different positions, combinations, are seven. So, and three left formed of five faces remain. 14 and Vimala is No. 1. 15 and Agni is No. 2. and Agni and Vimala is No. 3. these are the combinations formed by five faces.

There are, therefore, the five faces, namely, 14, Tatpurusa, Sadyojita, Vimala and Agni, that groups of three, four by combining 14 with 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 968, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000.

There are also five ways to combine the five faces or groups of faces by observing the rule mentioned above that there are five combinations: Tatpurusa, Sadyojita, Vimala and Agni. (1) Tatpurusa, Sadyojita, Vimala, Agni, (2) Tatpurusa, Sadyojita, Vimala, Agni, (3) Tatpurusa, Sadyojita, Vimala, Agni, (4) Tatpurusa, Sadyojita, Vimala, Agni, (5) Tatpurusa, Sadyojita, Vimala, Agni. By observing the rule mentioned above, five combinations are formed. These are the

¹ The combinations of the five faces are: (1) Tatpurusa, Sadyojita, Vimala, Agni, (2) Tatpurusa, Sadyojita, Vimala, Agni, (3) Tatpurusa, Sadyojita, Vimala, Agni, (4) Tatpurusa, Sadyojita, Vimala, Agni, (5) Tatpurusa, Sadyojita, Vimala, Agni.

commentation can adopt is to make explicit a hidden sense, which one could pick up by the abbreviated form in which the Āgama has come down or by the secrecy of the doctrine. Abhinavagupta commits himself to a very strict position by saying that everything is told in the *Mahātānttra* explicitly or implicitly (*lingatāh*).¹ And he states in another passage that there cannot be any question of non-literal meaning (*tārthavāda*) as regards the word of Śiva.² This, however, is a theological program: in concrete exegesis Abhinavagupta's system is well aware of non-ultimate statements in a valid scriptural text. The usual definition of a *vārtika* could therefore be justified: it would be a commentary that could find its way through conflicting statements about Śaiva practice by rejecting some, namely provisional, rules like the injunction to perform a specific worship, and by providing the arguments that can establish a hierarchy of these conflicting injunctions. I think this approach can be discerned in the discussion of *Mālinī* 18.74–81 in the fourth chapter of the *Tantrāloka* (212–278)³ and the same principle applies to our text.

The text of the *Vārtika* falls into two disparate chapters, the first with 1135, the second with 335 verses which are mostly *anuvṛtthi* with only short passages or single verses in longer metres. There are not many quotations and astonishingly few from the MVT. The first question is therefore, on which parts or concepts of the Tantra the author is actually commenting upon.

One view to be found in the secondary literature is that of the *Vārtika* being a commentary only on the first verse of the MVT. It is based on the concluding verse by the author himself, in which he states that he has commented only on the first verse, and this impression is reinforced by the fact that the first verse of the Tantra is quoted in full in the beginning of the commentary. This has created some funny conceptions, as for instance in PANDEY's pioneering volume on Abhinavagupta, where he says of the *Pūrvapañjikā*:

"From its name, Pañcikā, which means a detailed exposition, and from the frequent references to it in most of Abhinava's writings it seems to have been a very big work. An idea of its size can be formed from the available part of the Mālinī Vijaya Vārtika which is an exposition of only the first verse of the Mālinī Vijaya Tantra, as he himself says in its concluding line:

pravarapuranāmadhaye pure pūrve kāmīrīko 'bhinavagupīah
Mālinyādimavākhye vārtikam etad racyati sma.

What must have been the size of the detailed exposition of the whole of the above Tantra, it is not difficult to imagine. This work, however, seems to be irrecoverably lost. Its loss to Śaiva philosophical literature is irreparable."⁴

Although it does not become clear whether it is PANDEY's view that the *Vārtika* as it is is incomplete, it seems that he takes the statement about the *Vārtika* being a commentary on the first verse only as literally true.

We find another early statement on the *Vārtika* by MADHUSŪDAN KAUL, who writes in his introduction to the MVT: "The first verse of the Tantram he took up in his Mālinīvijayavārtika and explained it so thoroughly that connotations of several terms are made clearly intelligible. The points, that could not find room in the Vārtika for want of space and owing to its limited scope as Vārtika, he discussed in the Tantrāloka."⁵

There is probably no word limit for a *vārtika* and the argument of space is therefore not to be taken seriously, but the impression that the connotations of the first verse of the Tantra are explained at great length is certainly correct. This first verse, which forms verse 14 of the *Vārtika* runs as follows:

The rays of the moon of knowledge which issue from the face of Paramesa [i.e. Śiva] and are capable of destroying (everything) opposed to universal bliss surpass all. (14)

The light from the half-moon on Śiva's head, which is identified with knowledge, is reflected in his face and sends out cooling rays. Although not easily understood from a north-European perspective, one standard comparison for *saṃsāra* is "heat", and the knowledge that destroys ignorance that is the cause for *saṃsāra*, is consequently associated with the coolness that is embodied in the moon.⁶ But for Abhinavagupta this is not just an introductory poetic image in a *śloka*-verse. It implies the descent of this liberating knowledge from its source above Śiva's head down to his five heads and, through this process of reflection, its differentiation into scriptural revelation. The explanation of this idea forms the first section of the *Vārtika* which is the topic of the present thesis.

[1] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[2] MVT, introduction, p. xvi.

[3] One must add that besides this post-Indian image Kashmiri writers have also led to the description of a *śaivaśāstra* (*Tantrāloka*, p. 135.)

[4] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[5] MVT, introduction, p. xvi.

[6] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[7] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[8] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[9] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[10] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[11] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[12] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[13] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[14] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[15] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[16] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[17] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[18] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[19] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[20] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[21] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[22] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[23] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[24] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[25] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[26] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[27] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[28] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[29] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[30] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[31] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[32] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[33] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[34] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[35] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[36] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[37] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[38] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[39] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[40] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[41] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[42] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[43] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[44] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[45] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[46] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[47] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[48] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[49] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[50] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[51] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[52] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[53] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[54] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[55] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[56] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[57] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[58] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[59] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[60] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[61] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[62] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[63] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[64] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[65] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[66] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[67] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[68] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[69] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[70] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[71] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[72] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[73] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[74] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[75] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[76] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[77] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[78] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[79] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[80] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[81] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[82] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[83] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[84] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[85] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[86] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[87] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[88] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[89] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[90] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[91] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[92] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[93] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[94] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[95] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[96] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[97] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[98] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[99] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[100] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[101] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[102] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[103] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[104] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[105] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[106] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[107] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[108] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[109] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[110] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[111] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[112] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[113] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[114] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[115] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[116] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[117] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[118] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[119] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[120] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[121] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[122] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[123] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[124] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[125] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[126] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[127] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[128] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[129] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[130] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[131] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[132] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[133] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[134] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[135] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[136] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[137] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[138] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[139] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[140] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[141] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[142] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[143] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[144] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[145] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[146] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[147] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[148] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[149] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[150] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[151] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[152] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[153] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[154] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[155] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[156] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[157] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[158] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[159] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[160] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[161] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[162] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[163] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[164] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[165] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[166] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[167] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[168] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[169] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[170] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[171] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[172] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[173] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[174] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[175] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[176] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[177] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[178] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[179] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[180] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[181] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[182] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[183] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[184] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[185] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[186] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[187] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

[188] PANDEY (1963), p. 37.

A summary of the whole *Vārtika* is beyond the present work, but we shall briefly discuss its structure. If we look at the concluding verses of the first chapter, we find an explicit statement to the effect that the first Kāṇḍa is a commentary on chapters 1–17 of the *Mālinīttantra*. Obviously the reader has to be made aware of this fact, because there are hardly any indications for it in the text itself. We see on the other hand from the choice of words that, at the end of the first Kāṇḍa, Abhinava still has the first verse of the Tantra in mind. The second Kāṇḍa of the *Vārtika*, which has only 335 verses, starts unambiguously with a reference to the 18th chapter of the Tantra, thereby confirming that it deals with the remaining chapters of the root text. Again, the end of the second Kāṇḍa is reminiscent of the first verse of the *Mālinī* and the last verse of the *Vārtika* contains the statement quoted above that the author has only commented on the first statement of the Tantra.

From the fact that the first part, at least in some sense, deals with chapters 1–17 of the Tantra and the second part with the remaining chapters, we can conclude that the text of the *Vārtika* as we have it is a self-contained work, and this is recognized by the editor Madhusūdan Kaul in his introduction to the edition of the text.¹³ Much less obvious is the reason for the division into two unequal chapters. The MVT is not divided into pādas but into 23 adhikāras; the 18th chapter is in a section on Yoga, which started with chapter 12, but its importance for Abhinavagupta lies in the fact that it is mainly there that he can find passage to sustain his monistic interpretation of this basically dualistic text and to postulate a hierarchy of levels inside monistic Śaivism.¹⁴

Another important question is the relationship between the *Mālinīśloka-vārtika* and the *Tantrāloka*. I cannot quote any conclusive figures, but it seems that there are many parallels and quite a few almost identical verses between the second Kāṇḍa and parts of the TĀ, but almost none of the first section of the first Kāṇḍa, i.e. vss. 1–399. Although there is the possibility that the *Pārvatīpārijitā* has dealt with the same issues, this section of the *Vārtika* was unique enough to be referred to by Abhinavagupta himself in the last chapter of the *Tantrāloka* for its description of the descent of the five streams of the Śaiva revelation:

“The nature of the [five] streams, starting from the immovable highest state, has been taught by us in the *Mālinīśloka-vārtika* in detail and those eager to know should be able to understand it from there. But we do not sanction useless repetition.”¹⁵

¹³ “The whole work has been thrown into two parts or Kāṇḍas, the first part being devoted to the subject matter dealt with in the first seventeen chapters in the above Tantra and the latter throwing light on the remaining portion.” First page of the Introduction to the Kashmiri Edition of the *Vārtika*.

¹⁴ See ANAND PUSKAS (1992) for dualism in the *Mālinī*, and SANDERSON (1997) for the same problem of the eighteenth chapter.

¹⁵ *maṇḍana śrīnandam rūpam saṁtaraṅgapatāḥ ātmasaī | arabhya vānareṇakam mālinīśloka-vārtike | jñātasu āṇa credam aradhānāṁ kṛtānāḥ | sayam tōkāvācānam apūṭham madrisānāḥ ||37.31||*

Chapter 3

The Text of the *Mālinīśloka-vārtika*

3.1 The Names of the Text

The Tantra which is the basis for Abhinavagupta's commentary is called *Mālinīvijaya-tāra* or abbreviated *Mālinīvijaya* and our text is therefore called *Mālinīvijaya-vārtika* (MVV), *Mālinīvārtika*, or *Mālinīśloka-vārtika*, the last one being used by Abhinavagupta himself to refer to the text in the TĀ. There have been a few misconceptions about the name of the text and some remarks on this matter are necessary for clarification.

In his article on the *Works of Abhinavagupta* RAGHAVAN notes: "Further on p. 107 of his *Tantrasāra*, (Kas. Texts. XVIII), Abhinavagupta makes mention of the *Tantrāloka* and adds to it a perplexing reference to a *śloka Vārtika*. Are we to understand a work of Abhinavagupta here, and if so, whether one of his known works or a new one?"¹ The text under discussion runs as follows: *an artham cātra darśyam tantrāloke śloka-vārtike ca*. Commenting on the same passage in his *Kṛtana Tantracism* RASTOGI says: "Besides, Abhinava refers to one *śloka-vārtika* in the *Tantrasāra*. It is uncertain whether this is identical with the famous Mīmāṃsā text of the same name by Kumārila. But the way Abhinava refers to it and the context in which it finds a place makes it quite probable that Abhinava might have attempted a work under this name. Or else it might be another name of the *Mālinīvijaya-vārtika*."² In his introduction to the *Tantrāloka* RASTOGI modified his view: he quotes reference to the *Tantrāloka* under the name *vārtika* and *śaṅkaradīpaśloka-vārtika*, which are given by Abhinavagupta in the *Īśvaraprayabhijñānavimarśinī*.³ As TĀ is quoted there, one must conclude that the TĀ has indeed been called *vārtika*. But from this and the "non-discovery of any text by the name of

3. The Text of the *Mālinīvijaya*

the *śloka-vārtika* (pertaining to Kashmiri Śaivism?)" he concludes that the cross-reference in the *Tantrasūtra* can only mean "in the *Tantrāloka*, which is a *śloka-vārtika*".

The confusion about the term *śloka-vārtika* arises, because it denotes above all a type of commentary; as the one by Kumārila was perhaps the most well-known, it could be referred to as *the Śloka-vārtika*, but technically both the TĀ and MVV are *śloka-vārtikas* and the fact that the name of the commentary is used a few times for referring to the TĀ does not exclude the possibility that it may be used for the MVV in another context. If, moreover, the names *Tantrāloka* and *Śloka-vārtika* are combined with "and", as in the *Tantrasāra* passage under discussion, there is no need for RASTOGI's laborious interpretation. We find the correct interpretation already in GSOLI's translation of the *Tantrasūtra*: "nel *Tantrāloka* e nel commento in versi al *Mālinīvijaya*."⁴

3.2 Editions and Manuscripts

The MVV appeared in print for the first time in 1921 in the *Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies* (KSTS)⁵ and has, to my knowledge, never been reedited. We can ignore a version of the text that appeared in 1985 as a small booklet edited by Krishnānanda Sāgar, since it contains the text of the edition princeps, but the misprints produced by the new typesetting and the omission of the critical apparatus makes it virtually useless for this study.⁶

It is not easy to estimate the value of the first edition. Despite its shortcomings we must be very grateful for it, as for the whole KSTS, without which this segment of Tantric philosophy would still be studied from the *Survyadarśana-samgraha*. From this perspective to lament the lack of attention to detail would indeed be unfair, because the editors who wished to print virtually all the main texts of the known Śaiva philosophy of Kashmir could not indulge in long discussions. However, it must be noted that the editors sometimes decided on a text that hardly makes sense or is not even metrically correct.

The KSTS edition is based on two manuscripts which are described in the introduction as follows:

⁴ GSOLI (1979), p. 190.

⁵ Śrī Mālinīvijaya Vārtikam of Abhinava Gupta, Edited with notes by Pandit Madhusudan Kaul Shukla, KSTS XXXI, Srinagar 1921.

⁶ *Śrī Mālinīvijaya Vārtikam*, ed. by Krishnānanda Sāgar, Varanasi 1985, English Title: "Śrī Mālinīvijaya Vārtikam" [sic].

Ms. belongs to the manuscript section of the SRI PRATAP SINGH LIBRARY. This is one of the oldest Mss. in the stock. Its leaves are here and there numbered 250. The character in which the Ms. is written is old Sarada [1] Kashmiri paper of old type, one-half foolscap size has been used in the Ms. On an average, a page contains 13 lines of text, 12 letters in each. The first 11 leaves of the Ms. seem to have been written in the 15th century. The Ms. is complete with a few slips of pen. It does not contain any date.

b. This Ms. is on new Kashmiri paper. There is no mention of the date
 c. The copy of the Ms. was made. It is complete and is written out in
 d. The meter with a few mistakes here and there. It belongs to late Pa.
 e. RAXAD A BHUTARAKA son of PANDIT SIKADEVA of Srinagar.
 f. He lived the life of a Sāṅg teacher to the last day of his life."

the edition of the *Vāṛṇika* is also slightly discomfiting. The series would no doubt be desirable to find and recollate the old editions, but the current political situation in Kashmir is such that, so far, no attempt has been made to remove the old editions from circulation. As it can be made plausible that the whole recession is necessary to risk one's life for establishing the

I was fortunate in obtaining Xenox copies of both the
 text and the KST's edition, my enthusiasm was dampened
 by the fact that both manuscripts more or less share the omission
 of the last six lines of the text, which are available at present from
 other sources. I am not aware of any circumstances where a second copy
 of the text could not be obtained. Bearing in mind the historical
 fact that many of its manuscripts are of the late nineteenth century
 and the fact that the KST's edition is based on the late nineteenth century
 text, it is not more than transcripts of the two manuscripts
 that are available. The manuscript certainly deserves the
 name of 'transcript' and not 'copy' for the construction
 of the text. The manuscript certainly deserves the
 name of 'transcript' and not 'copy' for the construction

from Śāradā archetypes, but not only is one ms. dated comparatively early (AD. 1780), both often retain the correct reading against the Śāradā sources.

But even with these additional sources a meaningful text could often only be established through conjecture; out of the more than hundred instances in which the present edition differs from the KSTS edition, about half are conjectures. There are cases where one would want to argue that the conjectural reading was with a high probability the reading of the archetype, in other cases the suggested readings are diagnostic, that means they merely allow us to make sense of an otherwise meaningless text or help to restore the metre.

Prof. SANDERSON drew my attention to a further manuscript (G) in which only a few verses are quoted.

3.2.1 Critical Apparatus

In the apparatus of the present edition all variant readings⁷ of the manuscripts, with the exception of the purely orthographical variants that are mentioned below, have been listed according to the following conventions: a lemma does not indicate the beginning, but the full passage that is replaced in a particular manuscript with a different reading; it is not reported, if this variant is unmetrical. For instance: 352b svatantram: *svatantravram* J₂ means that in pāda b of verse 352 the reading of J₂ is unmetrical, not that one more syllable of the critical text has to be replaced to arrive at this variant.

As mentioned above, the *editio princeps* indicates the source of the readings from its two sources only as in *pathah*. These readings are marked summarily as "K" in the present edition. The siglum K_{ed} ("Kashmir Edition"), although describing the critical text of the *editio princeps*, is therefore also ambiguous, in cases where "K" is not mentioned it means "both Śāraḍa and Kashmiri", where "K" is specified it describes only one of them. All cases where the editors have emended a passage, or where I suspect a misprint, are mentioned explicitly.

As the siglum K, owing to its ambiguity, appears only where the two Śāradā mss. disagree, it was not possible to provide the present edition with a fully positive apparatus. It was on the other hand necessary to give a positive apparatus where K's reading was accepted, but was not identical with K₅₆, that is, in cases like the following:

* Unlike in classical Greek and Latin there are hardly any published collations of a substantial number of manuscripts in the field of Sanskrit editions, under these circumstances to produce a selective apparatus is inefficient, as it makes improvements with the text a re-collation impossible.

1 Introduction

3.3.2 J₂

number and title: 622 (1639) *Mālinīvārtikam*.
The tag on the outer wrapping has the following text (devanāgarī in italics):
XIII Raghunatha Temple MSS Library, JAMMU. No. 1638/8a. Title: *Mālinīvārtikam*. Author: Extent 129 *patra*. Age: saṃ 1846. Subject: *tantra*.
The left upper margin has a further number: 6028.
Devanagari. The abbreviation for the title *mā. vā* and the folio number are in the upper left margin. There are no *dagdas* and the verses are numbered only in the first few pages. Dated A.D. 1789.¹⁰

Beginning *1^o mālinīvārtikam* in the centre of the page, below a stamp of the library. The text starts on *1^o* after a few invocations: *śrīgṛasopānaṃ namah sṛgārate sṛasvaminmahā śrīdevyai siddhidāyinyai nāmah oṃ namo nāgdevyai oṃ vinulakā ...*

End: *in mālinīśloka-vārtikam śrīmahāmahāśāhāśvavācāryavarṇasrīmad-ābhīnavaṅgaṇapadavivācīnam sūnaptam iti śrīvidanī bhāṭṭarīm sadbhakṣanam* = *kubhāṃ bhavām* I. *Śrīmatsaṃ-ṭipatī* 1846 *caitra*

Palaeographical Notes. *ya* and *tha* are sometimes indistinguishable (5f; *paṭh* = *paṭh*); *śa* and *śa* are identical.

3.3.3 G

M. 1.10" kept in *Niederösterreichische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Graz*, and described in detail in JANERT AND POTI (1970), No. 803f. This is an undated Śaradā paper manuscript that contains the few verses from the *Uṇṇī* identified below.

M. 1.10"	MVV
15"	1.101.2cd-1017
	II 35-40

The attribution of the passage: *ity ācāryābhīnavaṅgaṇagururāṅkaḥ tāha nīṭṭa*, and another quotation from the text:

is clearly legible on the Xerox copy is added by hand and is confirmed by the outer wrapping of the manuscript.

3 The Text of the *Mālinīvārtikam*

35

M. 1.30	MVV
15 ^o 15.1	1.206cd-209b
15 ^o 15.24	1.258-259
15 ^o 15.16 ^o	1.255cd-257ab
16 ^o 16.7	1.271-272

3.4 Textual Criticism

3.4.1 General Principles

Unfortunately there is not much written on textual criticism as applied to Classical Sanskrit, nor is there consensus about the best approach.¹¹ The discussion of the theoretical problems in other disciplines evinces the wide divergences that exist: the BÉDIER school is extremely sceptical about the validity of editorial judgements, which results in an unwillingness to do anything else than print "the best" manuscript.¹² This rests on the assumption that the understanding of a medieval scribe must be nearer to the text we wish to publish than that of the contemporary editor. It is apparent that this cannot be applied to Sanskrit manuscripts, many of which were written by scribes who could not understand the texts they were copying. Moreover the sceptic's attitude against attempts to edit texts and the deconstructional pessimism it displays is hardly appropriate for a discipline like Indology, where the need for reliable editions is so obvious.

The other main trends define themselves by the degrees of acceptance or rejection of stemmatology. For some the construction of a stemma of all manuscripts of a text is still the very heart of textual criticism and I shall therefore deal with the question briefly and examine its application for editions of Classical Sanskrit.

The idea behind stemmatic analysis is to find a method through which the editor can arrive at the original reading of a text without editorial bias: it was

¹¹ In the field of classical learning there is protracted controversy about the methods including a good deal of polemic and *thoriam* (see HOPKINS (1972) and WEST (1973), p. 61).

¹² KANT (1969) (p. 158) summarizes the practical conclusions of this approach: "The current scepticism about conjecture extended, as it still may do, to the whole editorial process, and one form of the flight from judgement has been 'to condemn any critical treatment of manuscript material beyond a mere reproduction of the extant tradition or of one of its representatives.' One should 'be quite a student of Bédier reporting the master's view.' Select a manuscript which is of the poor known dialect, which is relatively old, which does not have many mechanical defects and one should reproduce this text without attempting correction unless there is a proved slip of the pen - verification should not be corrected."

...between the ...
...arrive at the reading ...
...ment. One has ...
...MANN while editing ...
...type was ...
...that contained ...
...from consideration ...
...followers, ...
...handover, ...
...that ...
...for editing any text ...
...to recognize the ...
...of the technique ...
...between ...
...the ...
...mechanical defect ...
...method ...
...there ...
...should ...
...the ...
...regime. If ...
...discuss ...
...after ...
...One ...
...of ...
...that ...
...There ...

...between the ...
...arrive at the reading ...
...ment. One has ...
...MANN while editing ...
...type was ...
...that contained ...
...from consideration ...
...followers, ...
...handover, ...
...that ...
...for editing any text ...
...to recognize the ...
...of the technique ...
...between ...
...the ...
...mechanical defect ...
...method ...
...there ...
...should ...
...the ...
...regime. If ...
...discuss ...
...after ...
...One ...
...of ...
...that ...
...There ...

...between the ...
...arrive at the reading ...
...ment. One has ...
...MANN while editing ...
...type was ...
...that contained ...
...from consideration ...
...followers, ...
...handover, ...
...that ...
...for editing any text ...
...to recognize the ...
...of the technique ...
...between ...
...the ...
...mechanical defect ...
...method ...
...there ...
...should ...
...the ...
...regime. If ...
...discuss ...
...after ...
...One ...
...of ...
...that ...
...There ...

...between the ...
...arrive at the reading ...
...ment. One has ...
...MANN while editing ...
...type was ...
...that contained ...
...from consideration ...
...followers, ...
...handover, ...
...that ...
...for editing any text ...
...to recognize the ...
...of the technique ...
...between ...
...the ...
...mechanical defect ...
...method ...
...there ...
...should ...
...the ...
...regime. If ...
...discuss ...
...after ...
...One ...
...of ...
...that ...
...There ...

...between the ...
...arrive at the reading ...
...ment. One has ...
...MANN while editing ...
...type was ...
...that contained ...
...from consideration ...
...followers, ...
...handover, ...
...that ...
...for editing any text ...
...to recognize the ...
...of the technique ...
...between ...
...the ...
...mechanical defect ...
...method ...
...there ...
...should ...
...the ...
...regime. If ...
...discuss ...
...after ...
...One ...
...of ...
...that ...
...There ...

...between the ...
...arrive at the reading ...
...ment. One has ...
...MANN while editing ...
...type was ...
...that contained ...
...from consideration ...
...followers, ...
...handover, ...
...that ...
...for editing any text ...
...to recognize the ...
...of the technique ...
...between ...
...the ...
...mechanical defect ...
...method ...
...there ...
...should ...
...the ...
...regime. If ...
...discuss ...
...after ...
...One ...
...of ...
...that ...
...There ...

For instance, confusion of aspirated and non-aspirated consonants, if – as in Kashmir – regional pronunciation does not differentiate between them. But the production of a copy from another manuscript involves also the category of more conscious processes of alteration. WEST's description for Greek and Latin applies to Sanskrit to a considerable extent,²⁴ but there are further indications that the phenomenon of contamination should never be underrated: the comparatively short life-span of manuscripts in India and the consequently high rate of copying – in connection with the fact that probably most of the scribes could hardly follow the text they were copying – must have led to very faulty texts that regularly had to be purged of errors.²⁵ This no doubt was done by scholars, especially in the process of composing commentaries on a text.²⁶ If we keep in mind that writing materials were at times precious, the copying will have been undertaken only when necessary. The first attack of insects would hardly have prompted the rewriting of a whole codex. There are also special cases like Kashmir, where one can find perfectly plausible texts almost without scribal mistakes. The reason, as noted already by BÜHLER, is that there often Pandits instead of half-literate scribes would copy manuscripts.²⁷

²⁴ "The fact that errors occur in copying, and that the comparison of different manuscripts brings variant readings to light, is no modern discovery. It was well known in antiquity, as well as in the Middle Ages, and the precaution was sometimes taken of checking a newly made copy not only against its immediate exemplar but against another manuscript. When a variant was noticed, it might be introduced into the new copy by correction, or it might be noted in the margin . . . between the lines [. . .]. When a copy furnished with this kind of primitive critical apparatus served in its turn as an exemplar to another scribe, he might do any of three things. He might preserve both the variant in the text (1) and the marginal variant in their places; he might retain 1 and omit 2; he might adopt 2 in the place of 1, without mentioning 1; or he might put 2 in the text and 1 in the margin. This confluence of readings from more than one exemplar is known as 'contamination.'" WEST (1973), p. 12.

²⁵ Compare modern Sanskrit *śodharavivṛti prakāśa* etc. for "to edit". See APTÉ (1983), 33.

²⁶ Although many Indian commentaries mention and discuss variant readings there are hardly any accounts of the methodology. We can imagine that it must have seemed obvious to those who claimed scriptural authority. In the introductory verses of his *Māhātmyaśāstra* Rāmānjantha says that the commentator has to choose from among "differing readings" (śrīkṛṣṇaśāstra) which stem not from the original, but from error committed by students (śrīkṛṣṇaśāstra) or were copying the text (1). To point out these errors is unwise ("pāhābhedaśāstraśāstra"). See De (1986), 12. A forthcoming work on Rāmānjantha's *Kṛṣṇanāṭyaśāstra* (Introduction) for the edition of the whole passage. But exegeses do use further arguments in defending their own version. For instance, the evidence of old manuscripts (e.g. *Śrīkṛṣṇaśāstra* 12ab: *pāhābhedaśāstra* is ascertained by the *pāhābhedaśāstra*), and it would be very difficult to find them.

²⁷ BÜHLER (1877).

It might be argued that contamination should at least be ruled out in the case of manuscripts that are not too far in time from the author. But even if we do not take Al-Bīrānī's caustic remarks that Indian scribes are able to run a text in one or two copies as literally true,²⁸ we must conclude from a recent example that in the case of works with a wide appeal and therefore swift dissemination mere decades can be enough to produce a contaminated text!²⁹

A special case is the revision of a text by the author himself that was already circulating in manuscripts;³⁰ every editor must dread the day when he will be forced to accept such an assumption. In the case of Sanskrit a more typical source of error is certainly the practice of memorizing texts.³¹ Whereas the distorting influence of quotations in Latin and Greek is supposed to be due to "inaccurate memory",³² it is more likely in the Indian context that a scribe substituted the reading he had learned by heart for the one in the manuscript, the more so if we recall that Indian culture always had a higher regard for oral than for written knowledge.

The conclusion must be a strong devaluation of stemmatology except in specially proven cases and the application of methods designed for "open recensions". It can nevertheless be very helpful to produce a stemma from evidence that is less vulnerable to contamination, like clear scribal errors, omission etc., in order to have a criterion for selecting a reading if all other methods fail.³³ If we ignore special cases like compilations,³⁴ our guidelines must be the canons for the edition of open recensions,³⁵ once contamination is proven. The main rule is that unless criteria of grammatical, metrical or contextual plausibility etc. force us to emend the transmitted reading,³⁶ a reading without variants is accepted as archetypal; if variants exist, the one that can explain the origination of the others is accepted as primary. The application of the last rule leads to a variety of further considerations: often the more difficult reading is original, as

²⁸ The passage is quoted in SLAIE (1993), p. 4, fn. 3.

²⁹ ROCHER (1985).

³⁰ See WEST (1973) for historical examples.

³¹ See BÜHLER (1896), p. 4 on *mukhaśāstra* *vidyā*.

³² WEST (1973), p. 17.

³³ As SRINIVASAN has pointed out, "Kontaminationskritik" is unable to select a correct reading from true synonyms.

³⁴ See SRINIVASAN (1980) for a detailed study of the composition of the *Nāradaśāstra*. There are also attempts to apply the whole apparatus of techniques, developed for the study of the New Testament (source criticism, redactional criticism etc.), to compiled works. Compare also ARRAU (1986), p. 210f.

³⁵ The best work for this purpose is SRINIVASAN (1967).

³⁶ See KANI (1969) for a discussion of emendation.

seems intended to substitute the easier variant.³⁷ The other principles are related, like the avoidance of ambiguity or redundancy by redactors. In cases where no clear decisions³⁸ are possible, stemmatic considerations can be of help.

3.4.2 The Textual Transmission of the *Vārtika*

Any analysis of the stemmatic relationship between the surviving manuscripts of the *Vārtika* is marred by the poor design of the *editio princeps*. We cannot even exclude that the editors have silently corrected "simple" scribal mistakes, thereby further obfuscating the relationship of their sources. This and their failure to report the sources of variants invariably degrades the edition to the status of a contaminated manuscript thereby pushing the relationship between the Śāradā mss. out of sight.

The first observation concerns the lacunae: virtually all the omissions in the *Ms.* are to be found also in the two Jamnu mss., but there are further omissions in the Jamnu manuscripts, quite a few of them identical ones. One insertion is shared by Jc and K.³⁹ This means we have to conclude that the text of the *Mahātīkā* survived at one time in its history only in one manuscript, from which all other copies derive.⁴⁰

Judging from the variant readings it might seem that the patterns of agreement point to a group formed by J₁ and J₂ against the Śāradā mss. But if we look closer into the quality of errors that separate these groups, we find almost no agreement between the Jamnu mss. in "clear scribal errors";⁴¹ most of the agreement is in meaningful variants, which may have arisen through contamination. One might argue that we may at least assume that the contamination originated from the archetype of Jc, but as even the corrector of J₁ had access to variants overlapping with the Śāradā mss. (cf. the marginal note in 15d), it is more plausible that the *Vārtika* is transmitted in an open recension. The high

percentage of metrically correct and more or less meaningful variants among readings point to considerable reduction in the course of its transmission.

3.4.3 External Evidence

An important issue is the status of the external transmission of parts of the text in quotations. We have seen that all surviving manuscripts go back to an already incomplete and possibly quite faulty archetype; additional evidence from outside the transmission could therefore be extremely valuable. The observation that, compared to the variants inside the transmission of the *Vārtika*, the external witnesses sometimes preserve an abruptly different state of the text with sometimes even convincing variants might be taken as a proof of this. On the other hand there are several factors that demand caution: the *Vārtika* is quoted only a few times in later works, and – apart from one instance in Śivopādhyāya's commentary on the *Vijānabhairava* – these quotations are to be found in Jayaratha's commentary on the *Tantrāloka*. Since the source of these quotations is not mentioned, the strong variation could also indicate that Jayaratha, as suggested by GNOLI, sometimes quotes in fact from another, now lost text by Abhinavagupta, the *Pārvapāñjikā*. But even where it is clear that the *Vārtika* itself is quoted, another consideration speaks against using external evidence as equal to the transmitted text. It has been observed that Abhinavagupta's quotations are often not literal, even when he quotes scripture. This is only partly explained by the necessities of the metre: if we take, for instance, the recurring quotation from Kallaja's lost *Tanvirthacintāmañjī*, we can see that even when writing in prose our authors did not feel obliged to quote literally.⁴² The reason for this is to be found in the rules for Tantric exegesis (*vākyvāda*) – expounded by Abhinavagupta himself in the *Tantrāloka* – , which do not demand a word for word explanation, but simply enjoin that the teacher should propound units of meaning (*vaśni*) in the Tantra by various exegetical means.⁴³ This freedom in exegesis can be

Generally the more difficult, but not the more unlikely reading ought to be selected (Wien 1955, p. 5). In my opinion, SRINIVASAN's chapter 1.4.5.1 ("Einige Male läßt sich die ... nicht oder nicht befreitlegend, interpretieren. Eben dadurch aber weist sie sich als ...") takes the point too far to be made into a general principle. ... serves to typically variants that involve synonyms. Here the tendency of assimilation to them in the same context can serve as a guideline. (SRINIVASAN (1967), 1.4.5.11) ... apparatus on 257. ... is, since in its indications for this, as for instance, 39In, where all mss. transmit ... text, here the external transmission has retained a plausible reading ... and 39d. The insertion of what could at least be seen as the completion of a ... 2.71, perhaps insignificant.

⁴² *tantrāloka* *śivopādhyāya* TĀV, *tantrāloka* *śivopādhyāya* *śivopādhyāya* *śivopādhyāya* PTV, *tantrāloka* *śivopādhyāya* *śivopādhyāya* *śivopādhyāya* MVV 177.

⁴³ In chapter 28 of the TĀ there is a section in which the *Devatānāṭa*'s injunctions for explaining Agamas (*vākyvāda*) are taught; after a preparatory ceremony, which includes the drawing of lotuses on the ground and the worship of the goddess of speech (*trīśūvar*), the Guru is to explain the five *saṅghaṭṭas*, to show the consistency of the work, and use different exegetical methods, as for instance "leaping like a frog" (*śaṅkhaphra*), that is, omitting irrelevant passages, or "looking around like a lion", which could mean taking relevant passages from different parts of the text together. Abhinavagupta then goes on to

J_0	J_1 plus J_2
G	Göttingen ms.
$J_0 \text{ or } < \text{or } > J_1$	"or" inserted in the margin by second hand
[---]	lacuna indicated by scribe with three horizontal lines
[---]	illegible syllable
\bar{n}	syllable n deleted by scribe

Part 2

Text and Translation

1. pāṇi-janakah
2. samsphurāt
3. antatah
4. ad-purūṣa
5. m-valān
6. anavratān
7. anavratān
8. anavratān
9. anavratān
10. anavratān

The mother is resplendent (*mahatā*) with the ever new (eternal) that
rests on the immaculate power,
and the father, whose form is full, has hidden his desire in his
heart.

May my heart which is the emanation of vibrancy from the couple
and their force, full of the supreme nectar shine (1).
May my teacher surpass all, who with the rays of his knowledge appearing
everywhere has made the lotus of my heart blossom [and] who entrusted me
with the current of doctrines (*tantrāṅghaṇi*) that are dedicated to destroying the
obstacles. (2) *Śrī* is a revelation, which have as their aim the 'half of the world'
formed by the live dreams together with its reflection. This teacher
Sumati, who was purified by his teacher, the glorious Sumati and
devotees, may he be pleased with me and satisfied with
my work (3-4).

In my father, a scholar whose name is Cūḥala and who is more ven-
erable than his teachers. It is through his education (*śikṣā*), that I have
become free from attachment (5).

May the great, high-minded Bhūtārāja, who being my father's teacher, al-
ready has surpassed all, whose zeal is directed towards removing the
obstacles (6).

The lotus, a composition of the bliss of consciousness, which are exuded
by the Utpaladeva, because of his being awakened by the glorious
Somaśāstra, and spread into all directions, surpass all; in this they resemble
the fragrance which are exuded by a water-lily (*utpala*) which
becomes fragrant because of its awakening (blissoming) which is the
glorious beauty (7).

The words of the glorious teacher Lakṣmanagupta, who teaches his Utpaladeva, the philosophy of recognition which cuts off *saṃsāra*, ex-
ceeds (8).

By the bee of my mind, though (*apā*) intoxicated only by reflecting
on the taste, is eventually satisfied with the ultimate pleasure. The
flavor of reality and, attaining unity with it, remain in the
state of the wealth of different sounds (doctrines) (9).

et. t param trīkaṁ purvāṁ sarvasākyavibhāgavat ||20||
 atra bhavaśamullāsaśaṅkāśaṁkocavicyuteḥ |
 svamandaśatamātramātrīcchākaṁmadḥkṛtrayaṁ ||21||
 tūṭha vā jñānavah saivadrśtāv ittham anyarūpayan |
 saivādrśte cidābhīdamātrānubhavadallayāḥ ||22||
 tad icchā tavaṭi jñānam tāvat tāvat kriyā hi sā |
 śivakeśaśaktiritayasaṁarasyena vartate ||23||
 eṇampuṣyadaparamas tadābhinnobhaved iti |
 'yau cedāśiśvsvatmābhūte saṁkocavarjanāḥ ||24||
 vikalpākalpanamulāḥ katham śāstrādisampadāḥ |
 kevalaśiśvā evayam bodhaḥ saṁvitprabhāmayah ||25||
 prakāśaśaśāyogāc cidāmaśaḥghanātmakāḥ |
 tatāśaśaśvabhāvo 'yam yāḥ prakāśāḥ prakāśate ||26||
 'eva kim na sastraughah kim anyair yuktidambaraḥ |
 pratyāgdevaśiddhaś tatāśau kevalam bhavet ||27||
 na hi hi-kīkaṁāṁśvavarnapūñjavitritāḥ |
 uktaśiśvāśaśvabhīṇāyām ātmasaṁsthasya bhāsanam ||28||
 'sy eva na vīna tasmād icchāmaśaśaḥ pravartate |
 svabhāvam āvabhāśasya vimarśam vidur anyathā ||29||
 prakāśo 'rthoparaktō 'pi tulyo ratnādīkair iti |

This is the supreme, primordial trinity, in which all powers are yet undivided. In a contraction [resulting from] the fear (*śaṅkā*) through the appearance of objects vanishes and the three [powers] of the subject, i.e. will, action and knowl-

jects vanishes and the three [powers] of the subject, i.e. will, action and knowl-
 jeets vanishes and the three [powers] of the subject, i.e. will, action and knowl-
 jeets vanishes and the three [powers] of the subject, i.e. will, action and knowl-
 jeets vanishes and the three [powers] of the subject, i.e. will, action and knowl-

This has been described by the master [Somananda] in his [work] "The Vi-
 edge, are therefore compleely dissolved in their own bliss."⁵ (20cd-21)
 This has been described by the master [Somananda] in his [work] "The Vi-
 edge, are therefore compleely dissolved in their own bliss."⁵ (20cd-21)
 This has been described by the master [Somananda] in his [work] "The Vi-
 edge, are therefore compleely dissolved in their own bliss."⁵ (20cd-21)

[Opponent:] If [Śiva is] thus [undivided] and the self of the world, then how
 can there be – as [the possibility of] contraction is excluded – the riches of
 Śāstras etc. which are rooted in the formation of differential thought? (24cd-
 25ab)

[Answer:] We teach that all knowledge is part of the light of consciousness
 and nothing but (*ghana*) being aware (*amāsa*) of consciousness [itself], as it
 is [logically] connected to the nature of light. Here 'being aware' means the
 inherent quality of the light to shine [i.e. become manifest]. (25cd-26)

Is not this [conscious light that which constitutes] the flood of Śāstras? What
 is the use of further arguments? In this state (*staura*) it [the flood of Śāstras]
 exists only as pervaded by the goddess of the highest [plane] of speech, but not
 yet differentiated into a mass of sounds which are used in every-day life and
 are a product of *māyā*. (27-28ab)

It is said in the *Pratyabhijñā* that "[only] what rests in the self appears [out-
 side]. Without it an awareness of will could not arise. The nature of appearance
 is known as 'becoming aware' [of the objects that appear], otherwise the light,
 even though coloured by objects, would be like [that of] jewels etc. [which are
 coloured by objects but not conscious of them]."⁶ (28cd-30ab)

⁵ "Therefore" translates the ablative in Sanskrit. Lit. "Because of the vanishing of contra-
 diction, there are three powers." (20cd-21)

⁶ Lit. "then that [experience] is his solution, it is his knowledge and of such [a nature] that it is
 action."

⁷ Lit. "The light that shines is of the nature of being aware. The rather free [the light] shines
 to express the purpose of the line in the argument, which is to define the nature of
 the light."

⁸ Lit. "many [dambara] other [many] arguments" dambara could imply also "many
 arguments."

⁹ Lit. "many [dambara] other [many] arguments" dambara could imply also "many
 arguments."

āpi bṛūhāṇyāyam eva vastuṣu tu spṛṣṭamāni
 ātmibhāṣitāsvasire 'pi kāle 'pi yunimistāntam || 55 ||
 bodhāṣya nāiva saṁtye ceth pūrvāpavakāṣaṇāṁ
 kṣālo viśeṣanātena yāśād bhāṣatā bhāṣatā || 56 ||
 viśeṣam ca tā tat prakāśam saktiśāyikaya vā 'pi
 bhāṣena vedyatām etā yāñā nīlām sarorūham || 57 ||
 na ca bodhāṣya vedyatvān kadācid upadaye
 vedyatvān bhāṣanātmānān tat prakāśaprasādatāḥ || 58 ||
 prakāśaḥ sa va bodhis ca na ced bodhināstāsthiṣṭhe
 prakāśamānam nīnam anavashī pravartate || 59 ||
 āta eva vimūḍhe ye bodham āprathamānakaḥ
 āprathaprathamānakaḥ brūyūḥ shvadevācāreṇi tu te || 60 ||
 tasmān kālo na bodhāṣya bhāṣatvāyāya kālpatē
 āpi vedyāya kālo 'śu bhāṣitkṛbhāvitvūṁ kṣamāḥ || 61 ||
 vīṣam hi bodhāñhinmān tat ātathāve na bhāṣate
 prakāśena samavīṣṭaṣṭa cīrām bhāvān prakāśate || 62 ||
 viśā prakāśa evam syāt sarvasvayā sadātānān
 syāt prakāśe bodhokṣe sa prakāśatvān aśnute || 63 ||
 āprakāśo 'pi bhāvaḥ cet prakāśmā sa vedyate
 āprakāśa tu aśau bhāvā ity āpi saraṇam tamah || 64 ||
 āśa caprakāśā bhāṣatvā prakāśmāṣāṁ sa cet kriat
 nuna 'śa sa bhāvo naṣṭā syāt svāprakāśatvāyucyete || 65 ||
 nāidrūpam prakāśam ca kartum vidhīr āpi kṣamāḥ
 nam etāḥ idāmbhāvān prakāśe sāt bhāṣate || 66 ||
 āśa etāḥ eva kimtye ittham āprakāśān prakāśatān
 bhāṣāya cāprakāśate prakāśbhāṣite sāt || 67 ||
 evam prakāśo bhāvā ity vastuṣṭhīr bhavet ||

[A:] We say that this is correct, but in reality these concepts of earlier and later do not exist for knowledge, even if the creation of *tattvas* has manifested perceptibly and time has unfolded. The reason is that time can divide [only] by being a qualifier [of something else]; and a qualifier [such as, for instance, a colour] is taught to be something which is distinctly (*bhēdena*) perceptible only in [together with something else], like 'a blue water-lily'. (55-57)

But it is never possible to perceive knowledge, as to be perceived something must appear; [but] this [appearance] is due to the grace of the light [of consciousness]. This [appearance] is light and it is knowledge; if not, it would be different from knowledge and the resulting limitation of light would indeed raise an infinite regress. (58-59)

Consequently those deluded people who describe knowledge not as expanding [to become the object], [but as] consisting of the expansion [i.e. manifestation] of the object, are deceived by their own words. (60)

Therefore time is unable to cause differentiation in consciousness, nor is this time capable of becoming a differentiator [i.e. differentiating quality] of the object of perception. For the universe does not exist outside of knowledge, otherwise it (*tad*) would not appear. (61-62ah)

[If we say that] objects¹⁴ appear variously, because they are pervaded by light, then the world would be manifest (*viśvaprakāśa*) to everyone all the time. [But] if there is light which is called knowledge [i.e. light belonging to the subject], the [object] becomes manifest. (62cd–63)

If, however, [one were to suppose that] an object is different from light, it would [still] be cognized as having light as its essence. For if we say 'this object is without light' [i.e. does not manifest], the doctrinal position (*śaraṇa*) would be darkness [i.e. ignorance of the object]. (64)

But if [theoretically speaking] this non-light, which has the nature of an object, would manifest, it would certainly disappear, because its nature, which is to be without light, would perish. And even the Creator is unable to turn something into light which is not [already] of the nature of light. (65–66ab)

[Opp:] But so far [your position means only that] the state of objectivity appears as soon as there is light. (66cd)

14 *jātan ekavacanam.*

tad alam vyatiriktsa prakāśena sivas tatāḥ || 68||
 tasmāt prakāśa evāsa gīto yāḥ paramah śivah ||
 sa evācintyaṇuhimā svātantryoddāmaghūmitāḥ ||69||
 prakāśate tatāḥ kais tatāḥ svabhāvair acyutasiñhāḥ ||
 nātra sarvatra sarvajñabhāvāḥ kāśana śaṅkyate ||70||
 ahaṁ caitro ghaṭaṁ vedmi na pāṭam, veda tam tv ayaṁ ||
 nāyaṁ veni pātah, so 'ham jāne ghaṭapatāv iti ||71||
 vedīśyāmi na vā, pīrvam ajānām naiva vā kvacit, ||
 kramena vedmi yugapad dvābhyāṁ ubhayavarjitam, ||72||
 sarvaṁ vedmi, na kimcid ca jāne, naivāsmi kāśana ||
 bhāvatāmā, nanu naivāham, aham sarvaṁ ca sarvadā, ||73||
 sarvaṁ asmy aham evaikāḥ kim sarvaṁ itarad bhavet ||
 ityādīr eka evāyaṁ prakāśaḥ pravijñbhate ||74||
 nanv eka yady asah kaścit, prakāśo na tadā parah ||
 katham bhaved, aho mōdhaḥ katham vyutpādyatām ayaṁ ||75||
 ekah prakāśaḥ svātantryāc citrarūpaḥ prakāśate, ||
 vastuṭaś ca na caitro 'sau, nācitra bhedadūṣaṇāt ||76||
 ghaṭaprakāśe vastrasya prakāśo yadi sambhavet ||
 nāsau ghaṭaprakāśaḥ syād dviprakāśo hy asau bhavet ||77||
 so 'pi cāsy eva, no nāsti tad idaṁ tvatpracoditam ||
 ghaṭātmanā prakāśo 'sya mā bhūd ity avaiśīhate ||78||
 tac cāyuktam prakāśasya bodhatvāt svātmajñmbhanam ||
 lakṣaṇam yadi tat ko 'yaṁ vrthā vāgajādanabaraḥ ||79||
 paricechinnaḥ prakāśatvaṁ jādasya kila lakṣaṇam ||
 jādād vilakṣṇo bodho yato na parimīyate ||80||
 rasmiād arkasya sabbhāve siddhe kaḥ khaḥ bālīśaḥ ||
 brūyāt katham ayaṁ svāṁśūsubhriṭāśesabhūr iti ||81||

So forget about [the theory of] a separate light: it is for this reason (*rasmiād*) that Śiva is in this way (*taṭhā*) described as only light. The highest Śiva alone (*ya* = *sa*) shines with the unconceivable power and moves around without restraint because of his autonomy. In this way he is not impaired by the various forms in which he appears. (68cd–70ab)

[However, [thus we see differing limited experiences, e.g.] "I, Caitra, perceive everything [but see the cloth]. But [he [i.e. someone else] perceives it]." "This cloth does not perceive [anything]." "I know both pot and cloth." "I will perceive or I will not." "I have known before, or sometimes [I have] not." "I come to know gradually, suddenly, in both [and] neither way s." "I know everything", and "I know nothing." "I do not have the nature of an object", "certainly (*uani*) I do not exist" and "I am always everything." "I, being one, am the world; how can the world be different [from me]." In these and other ways this one light appears (various-ly). (70cd–74)

[Opp:] It there is any single thing that is not this light (*asah*), how could it be that there is not some other light?

[A:] O, how can this fool be instructed? It is only a single light that spontaneously (*svatantryat*) appears in various forms. But in reality it is not manifold. [It is also] not undifferentiated, because this is disproved by the diversity [we perceive]. (75–76)

[Opp:] If the light of a cloth would exist in the light of a pot, it would cease to be the light of a pot, for it would be a double light. Such a thing may exist, [but] what you have described does not exist for us. [The objection] that the light of the [garment] in the form of a pot is not possible remains. (77–78)

[A:] But that is wrong. The light, as it is knowledge, pervades (*jñmbh*) one's own self. Since this is its characteristic, [your] deceiving verbosity¹⁷ is useless. (79)

It is said that the characteristic of matter is the fact that its light is limited. Knowledge [i.e. consciousness] is different from matter, for it cannot be delimited. (80)

Therefore, as the existence of the sun is proved, who will be so foolish to say: "How is it possible that the whole earth is illumined by its own rays?" (81)

68d svātantryoddāma: svātantryoddhāma J. 71b tv ayaṁ: divyone Ka. 72a po-
 pravijñam J. 72b ajānām (conj.): ajānam Ka J. 72d varjitam: ta rjita J. 75a yady asah
 am itarad: sarvam itarad J. 74d pravijñbhate: pravijñbhate J. 75a yady asah
 sah J. 76c vastuṭaś ca: vastuṭas tv J. 77b unclear marginal note in J. 78a ghaṭ-
 conj: p. caitro eva Ka J. cāsyatva J. 80 = Bodhapatadāśikā 8. 81c brūyāt
 J. 81d saśa mesa J.

15. Lit. "it is not assumed."

16. Caitra is commonly used for "any person", "X".

17. More literally: "pompous mesh of words."

[illegible]

Therefore, as the light is proved, all devoting concepts are (like) following the behaviour of a [un]faithful woman who has sexual relations with everyone [although her husband is 'proved'] (82)

If the light did not exist, who would it be? Would you exist, would there be darkness or would nothing at all exist? Or how could it [even] be silent? (83)

For this reason, time cannot bring about anything [i.e. any difference] even in objects, since they are part of *Bhāratva* through their identification with light. (84)

[Opp:] But how, for heaven's sake, can there be the use of words [denoting time] like 'there' etc [in your account of reality?] (85a)

[A:] Listen! Though this has been said [before], it is again stated in detail. (85d)

This same light appears in various ways, but never for anything else [i.e. it does not illuminate an independent object], for it alone shines. (86)

This [light], as it is absolutely superior (*paratannōdārā*), manifests everything. Because it is autonomous, its power of will is called 'autonomy'. (87)

And it rests in its own self, because nothing that is different from it can exist.¹⁹ This 'resting in one's own self' is called bliss of God. (88)

The power of its autonomy lies in the fact that [even in the process of manifestation, which implies duality] it is never separate from its own nature. [For] it is its own realm of self-light, that it causes the confusing beauty¹⁹ of the world to appear. (89)

This activity of manifesting [objects] is called 'power of action' in the Śāstras. It is responsible for the self-differentiation (*kalānā*) [of light] into various *īśams* etc. How could this manifestation possibly take place in something unmanifested (*anavahīta*?) Therefore the inner appearance of it is the 'power of knowledge', which is called 'I'. (90–91)

Up to this point the form of God, which rests in his own self alone, is called 'awakening' (*īśamasa*); therefore the pervading Lord has five powers. (92)

[For the purpose of worship] he [is described as having] three powers or one power, or [as being the one] God alone. Or (*artha*) there is power alone which is described in the *Sāṅkṣarā* as the Goddess. (93)

[19] I.e. 'because of (my) *gatah*' the non-existence of [something] that is different from it.

vākṣyate caṅgaśūdratub kathitetyādītaḥ param |
sarvarkasāṅc anekatvaṃ gacchati mabheśinā ||94||
sa evaṃ nirbharāṇāṇāṃ dvāntīyāṇāṃ sūtrīḥ |
sodaryāḥ sabdasāṇāṃ bhāṣyate bhāṣavādibhiḥ ||95||
śrīdharmānandam vāpi yady apy asya na vastutaḥ |
sadbhāṣitāḥ bhāṣet kimcid anyad apy ōbhavā prabhoḥ ||96||
tathā ca bhāṣayaty eva deva esa tathā tathā |
tatas tadānūṣāreṇa sarvo 'yaṃ kalpanākramah ||97||
na ca tat kalpanāmātram tathāive 'py atha kākṣitūḥ |
tathā saṃkalpaṇam deva yad vā kalpayatām tathā ||98||
evam caṅsa prakāśatāṇāṃ saptaśatīṇāṃ parāḥ |
vācītyabhāṣaṇāṃ kurvan kālāṃ bhāṣayati prabhuh ||99||
vācītyabhāṣaṇam kūrvaṇ kālāṃ bhāṣayati prabhuh ||99||
tataḥ vābhāṣaṇāṇāṃ kālāśaktyaṇurodhaḥ ||100||
na ca kināṭ tadetyādīr uparāgaḥ pravartate
na ca kināṭ tadetyādīr uparāgaḥ pravartate ||101||
yatra tanyatām nāma tat prakāśavaśam śhītam |
na ca kināṭ tadetyādīr uparāgaḥ pravartate ||102||
tathā sūddhapade vāpi vidyādau tattvamāṇḍale |
tathā sūddhapade vāpi vidyādau tattvamāṇḍale ||103||
tathā sūddhapade vāpi vidyādau tattvamāṇḍale |
tathā sūddhapade vāpi vidyādau tattvamāṇḍale ||104||
tathā sūddhapade vāpi vidyādau tattvamāṇḍale |
tathā sūddhapade vāpi vidyādau tattvamāṇḍale ||105||

And Śiva will say [in the *Mālinīnātra*, in a later passage] starting from '[this power] of the creator of the world is said [to be inherent in him]': 'She, being one, becomes many'. (94)
And God (*yaṅm*), being perfectly established in himself through a state of rest in a bliss replete [with all things-], is denoted by many (*śaṅdarbhā*) appropriate (*sodaryā*) terms such as, for instance, "Bhairava". (95)
Even if it is nearer [to him] or further away [from him], the group of words (*śabhojātāḥ*), or anything else, does not actually (*vastutaḥ*) pertain to this omnipotent God (*asya* ... *prabhoḥ*). Thus this God manifests in various ways; therefore the whole process of conceptualization [can] only follow this [manifestation]. (96-97)
And [on the other hand] it is not merely conceptualization. Even if it were, [our doctrine] would not be impaired: God may form concepts in this way or he may cause others to do so. (98)
And in this way [Śiva], who is essentially light, is higher than the thirty-seventh [*tatvam*]. (99ab)
[It is only] by causing the appearance of diversity that the Lord manifests time. This manifestation of diversity is termed "the power of time". Thus it is because of our (*āsmākaṃ*) accordance (*anurodhaḥ*) with Śiva's (*etat*) power of time manifesting that qualifications²⁰ [of time referred to by words] like "then" etc. exist. (99cd-101ab)
It is not [the case], that [time] does not exist in [Śiva] at all, [for] how can anything exist except in him. It could spread in another reality [and] would still be dependent on light. (101cd-102ab)
[Opp:] If it were as you say, [it would follow that], since the pure Bhairava [would] exist in the lower impure (*sūddhetara*) group of *tatvas*, or in the group of *tatvas* that is intermediate between purity and impurity (*sūddhāsūddha*), [i.e.] impure knowledge and [the remaining *kañikas*], there would be no difference [between them]. (102cd-103)
[A:] We dance out of joy now! What we would have had to explain laboriously, is already²¹ present in your mind.²² (104)
The distinction between pure and impure has no place in discussions of the highest reality. But caused by [the necessities of] those [discussions], it is entrenched in the mind of the ignorant. (105)

20 Lit. "colorations"
21 Lit. "spontaneously" (*tatvam*)
22 Lit. "moves around in your heart"

nānu dūdhānāṁ dīrghāyudhā yudha bhedo na vatsāyau
 vācivācīmatā evaṇa cāstīram vāsīdatē tathā [106]
 vāsīdhat anā hi tātānām dīkṣāyā vādhānam tathā [107]
 yudha bāhūdhā bhedapradhānīdhatā yudha shīlī [107]
 ucyate nāduvā 'mumsin dānāt nāsty eva sarvathā
 bhāṇīti hi bhedānānyhe' pī vīkṣat bhedāvibhāṣanam [108]
 tad eva khalu samsāre māyāyādībhīṇh padāthi
 bandha ity ucyate tātra rūdībhīṇh samsāro matāḥ [109]
 tate infāntīr eṣam sūdhāśūdhādhīnīcāyāḥ
 ca 'nīram idam samyag bhāgavadgopadeśakam [110]
 bhāgavadgopam advāitām nīrvāḍanam ca prakāśate
 tāstapodeśasā itihām svāy yudī vādhāyādvibhedat [111]
 sāt bhāvētā tan nīrbhāyā nīrbhāyāyevā nīrūpātē
 ā vātē bhāvanāyāyevā vā pravesopaveśayoh [112]
 'Eṣa ki nīr nāstī tathā hi bhedāikajāyitā
 cā nīrbhāyā nīrkhalāstānāṅkāvāpānohe [113]
 'Eṣa ki cā nīram ca yānāḥ sarvā eva vīrjimbhātē
 = 'Eṣa tāt nīrāṅkāvānīkāvā sarvām pratyāyate [114]
 tadā yāyāgātī nīrbhāyāyēvā nī tu kūrūpī udāyātē
 tātānā yudī nānīrām dānāt tārky eṇa eva sāt [115]
 'Eṣa tātānā nīrām tātvasānīkhyākalpanānīrāmāyāḥ
 pātānā tātā kasmānī tātātānām tan nīrūpātē [116]
 tātānā yudī evā bhedātmāsānīr yāvāgātī grāhāt
 tātānā yudī pratīkṣepas tena nīrāṅkātā bhavēt [117]
 = eva vīrjīnī nīrbhāyānīrūpāpodeśanam
 tātānā yudī vāyāyāyānām tad vīdānām [118]

[Opp:] If [you say that] the division which is called 'purity and impurity' is unreal, then [it must be objected that] the very Śāstra you wish to explain contradicts this. (106)

Because here existence (*stūti*) is predominantly dualistic, [as is] frequently [demonstrated] by such [teachings] as the impurity of the *taṭvas* and therefore liberation through initiation. (107)

[A:] [In reply] we teach [as follows]: it is not [the case] that duality is completely absent from this non-duality, for it is taught that an appearance of duality

place in the pervading Lord, although he is free from diversity. (108)

This is indeed called bondage to the world [of transmigration] with words

the state and ignorance. Those who are immersed in it are called 'transmigrators'.

people' (*samsārin*) [and] their firm belief (*niscaya*) in pure and impure and

1. = dichotomies, stem from anxiety about *samsāra* (tat). (109–110ab)

other [dichotomies stem from anxiety about samādhi] (p. 101, 102).

Moreover this Sañña teaches the Tings of Śiva (omniscience) thoroughly.

(samyag). This Yoga of Siva is said to be non-dualistic and beyond dualistic destruction or this [Yoga] is given in this way: if [something]

chotomies. Instruction in this [Yoga] is given in this way. If [something]

is imagined to have a certain amount (*varur*) of division, it is explained by

analysing it again and again. (110cd–112ab)

For there is no practice (*tābhyasikī vṛtitiḥ*) for entering into and remaining in

(*upareśa*) the pervading Bhairava who is without duality, as both [entering and

remaining] are completely dependent on duality. (112cd–113ab)

Therefore all the efforts made by teachers and disciples serve only to remov

the inhibition (*śamkā*) caused by all the duality they imagine. It is for this reason

that everything [taught] in [this Śāstra] (*tha*) is unfolded by supposing duality:

But (*tu*) by supposing it one's whole life (*vīṇadaati*), one never becomes

but (iii) by supposing it one's whole life (*yavadgati*), one never becomes indifferent to it (as the Vedāntin attempts to become). For if dualism does not

indifferent to it [as the Vedāntin attempts to become]. For if duality does not become conscious, absolute consciousness (caitanya) is not established.

become conscious, absolute consciousness (*cidbrahmat* [remains] as the only
existent. Then there would be no more of the world, no more of the

existent. Then there would be no use for an enumeration, construction and de-

termination of *tattvas*. Why should thirty-five *tattvas* [below Śiva] then be con-

sidered? (115-116)

Therefore having accepted (*graham krtvā*) duality, which exists (*sthiti*) as d

vision, all one's life, one should become free from inhibitions only. *Das*...

through rejecting it. (17)

And this [is taught] in the *Vijñāna-Bhairavatantra*: the

śānam) [that is given there] after piarsing the ...

the crushing of [these] adamantines, and [the] piercing through [them] as far as possible

... of [these] adamantine notions, (118)

tat̥h̥a hr̥i sm̥ita s̥v̥at̥e bhāttanār̥yān̥na tat̥ |
 tat̥h̥as̥ te bhavas̥mbh̥r̥ant̥abhr̥ant̥in̥ m̥l̥bhāv̥ya bh̥indate || 119||
 j̥ñānan̥dan̥ ca n̥rdv̥ant̥an̥ deva v̥rtvā viv̥ṇyate |
 n̥rdv̥ant̥an̥ n̥ n̥rdv̥ant̥an̥ prak̥at̥ik̥ṇyate pad̥an̥ || 120||
 m̥l̥bhavyante bh̥r̥amaś̥ cet̥i cakāro 'trādh̥bhūāvah̥ |
 it̥ha cādv̥ant̥an̥ evet̥i pur̥at̥il̥ pr̥at̥an̥ṣyate || 121||
 ad̥h̥vasudd̥hyad̥ikān̥ dv̥ait̥e 'n̥ipap̥at̥it̥i vak̥syate |
 ab̥hed̥en̥ v̥ina n̥tan̥ n̥an̥ bhedaṃ v̥ināp̥i kim̥ || 122||
 s̥v̥ay̥an̥ kim̥v̥ ad̥v̥āye tat̥t̥ve bhedaṃ 'p̥i na na yujyate |
 id̥an̥ hr̥i tat̥ par̥adv̥ant̥an̥ bhedaṃyāgar̥ah̥au na yat̥ || 123||
 hr̥i ed̥e t̥i vis̥vabhav̥ān̥āṃ s̥vasvabhav̥avyavast̥h̥it̥eḥ |
 ab̥heidaṃ s̥a sab̥do 'yāṃ manye bhedayate ras̥āt̥ || 124||
 tad̥ al̥an̥ prak̥ram̥ n̥ir̥apyate
 p̥ram̥es̥h̥ k̥r̥ā bhedaḥkalp̥an̥āṃ |
 prak̥at̥ kur̥ite yat̥ha tat̥ha
 k̥alo 'p̥i v̥ij̥mb̥hate tat̥h̥a || 125||
 tat̥h̥ap̥i ca yat̥i bh̥ūnat̥an̥
 p̥aram̥it̥h̥en̥a kādācid̥ eva saḥ
 v̥at̥an̥t̥a t̥a s̥am̥vid̥āt̥mak̥ah̥
 v̥at̥an̥t̥a t̥a s̥am̥vid̥āt̥mak̥ah̥ || 126||
 n̥l̥l̥am̥ ekag̥h̥an̥abh̥āvav̥im̥ar̥śas̥are
 ved̥e t̥e yad̥ al̥an̥ eṣa kar̥om̥i c̥it̥rah̥ |
 tat̥ tad̥ ap̥are 'p̥i na m̥at̥racait̥ra-
 p̥ar̥a t̥a h̥yur̥athav̥āp̥i kal̥ham̥ na vid̥yut̥ || 127||
 c̥it̥āy̥ar̥an̥ hr̥i n̥ib̥id̥at̥an̥a eṣo 'tra bhav̥at̥ān̥
 hr̥i p̥r̥ hr̥i t̥ah̥ sv̥ap̥aram̥ it̥h̥ n̥āsty̥ ekam̥ ab̥hid̥an̥ |
 ved̥m̥ty̥ eṣa g̥h̥at̥at̥an̥v̥iś̥eṣap̥rak̥at̥ā
 c̥it̥āy̥ar̥an̥ p̥aram̥ah̥as̥i bh̥ān̥t̥it̥i kal̥h̥am̥ || 128||

For Bhāṭṭa Nārāyaṇa has clarified this (*tat̥*) state beyond duality (*n̥rdv̥ant̥an̥*) *pr̥at̥an̥ṣyate* [with the word] 'beyond dichotomies' in his hymn: "I adore you, O Lord, who creates the erroneous perception for those who are deluded by the world [only in order to] destroy it"²³ and [thereby] veils and unveils the bliss of knowledge which is beyond dichotomies." (119–120)

The word 'and' in "erroneous perceptions are created and [destroyed]" creates the [poetical sense of] wonder. (121ab)

And it will be explained later that in this system only non-duality exists. It will be said that the purification of the *adh̥vān̥*, for instance, is inexplicable in a dualistic system. (121cd–122ab)

[Opp:] [We can agree that the purification of the *adh̥vān̥* is not [explicable] without non-duality, but is it [explicable] without duality? (122cd)

[A:] This is correct, but even duality is not impossible in the non-dual reality. For the supreme non-duality [is not the absence of duality, but] exists, when (var) there is neither rejection nor acceptance of duality. (123)

But [in the sphere] of duality of all things, I think, the firmness of their own individual natures will automatically (*ras̥āt̥*) cause the word 'non-dual' to become something dual. (124)

But enough; we shall [now] expound the main topic; it has been said (*k̥ila*) that as much as (*yathā tat̥h̥a*) the highest Lord causes the construction of plurality to appear, indeed also time appears. (125)

But still he is never divided in the real sense. For, [as] he is consciousness, he simultaneously appears manifold [because of his autonomy]²⁴. (126)

[Opp:] If sentience (*sat̥yaved̥an̥a*) exists in the way [described] as the essence of a homogeneous awareness of being (*bh̥āv̥it̥*), then how [do you explain] that what I, who am manifold (*c̥it̥rah̥*),²⁵ do or know, is not also done or even known more or less by all the others. (127)

[A:] Tight indeed is the knot of illusion on this point (*atra*) in you! For we teach this: in our system (*it̥h̥a*) 'own' and 'other' do not exist; the one [reality] is undivided (*ab̥h̥idaṃ*). The fact that I perceive means that the characteristics that form a pot²⁶ are manifest. As has been said [before,] various manifestations appear in the highest light. (128)

²³ Lit.: "who, having created . . . destroys [it]" (*bh̥indate*: dative of the present participle).

²⁴ This translates the metrically wrong *sv̥at̥an̥v̥at̥*.

²⁵ Or amend to *c̥it̥rah̥* (suggestion by THIRUGAL).

²⁶ Lit.: "that are the body of a pot."

119cd 120ab = Śrīraṅgān̥d̥am̥ 71 123a k̥im̥ ad̥h̥
 123b na na: n̥an̥ J. 124 bc
 124d ras̥āt̥ (comp.): n̥āsty̥ k̥ā. ras̥āt̥ J. 126a āp̥i up to ab̥
 127d sv̥ap̥aram̥ is unmetrical. All manuscripts
 127d sv̥ap̥aram̥ sv̥ap̥aram̥ sv̥ap̥aram̥ sv̥ap̥aram̥ sv̥ap̥aram̥
 127d sv̥ap̥aram̥ sv̥ap̥aram̥ sv̥ap̥aram̥ sv̥ap̥aram̥ sv̥ap̥aram̥
 127d sv̥ap̥aram̥ sv̥ap̥aram̥ sv̥ap̥aram̥ sv̥ap̥aram̥ sv̥ap̥aram̥

tasme' ghanam vedmy aham ity amutra
 bhedo na kascin nano me ghaṭo 'yam |
 bhānti bhedapratibhānam asti
 naṭan na tasyāsa śivas tadāyam || 129||
 ata eva dvaiṣṭyānamukhyas tesu svakāstradeśeṣu |
 mīmāṅsāram eva mṛtyuṃ khaṇḍanādayivataḥ prāhuḥ || 130||
 tad evaṃ kālākalanopādhiḥito-parāḡgajāḥ |
 tadetyaḥi pratyante paratattve 'pi samvidah || 131||
 tatra pūrnākarupatvā sarvaṃ sarvatra cāpi tat |
 anyāśā khaṇḍanāyogāt na pūrnā pūrnata bhavet || 132||
 tatḥ pūrnatayā sarvasahabhairavadhāmani |
 pāṇḍitakā 'vam śāstrārthah śūmbhavah, śākyanusthitiḥ || 133||
 nyakṛtyaiśa parām devīm svātmāny udreeya variate |
 tham sa visisṛkṣaḥ san bhāvān viśaṣṭrāpadāt || 134||
 pūrvam uccahitānandaghaṇām abhajāta sthitiḥ |
 viśaṣṭrāpade ty eṣa viśargāvesabhāḡ api || 135||
 rikṣibhaviśyannānandaghaṇayā pūrnayā citā |
 tasyād ānandasaktyamsaviśargāvesānirbharah || 136||
 vartamānah svasaktyoghapūrnas cubhīd bhaviṣyati |
 nṛkāsaktir i ti tyātmacitrasaṃyedanātmakah || 137||
 vid'au devadevaḥ syād viśaṣṭarī pade sphuṭam |
 mṛtu kam vartamānāme samsto bhūtabhaviṣyati || 138||
 kaṇṭhābhavata jñātaṃ te svatantrē 'pi kecana |
 'artaḥ nāḍadher bhūtiṃ bhaviṣyac ca vibhajyate || 139||

For this reason [the perception] 'I perceive the pot' does not imply any du-
 ality. [Opp:] But in the perception "The pot is manifest *to me*" duality appears.
 [A:] It is not so [*naṭata*].²⁷ It does not [appear] to him, this Śiva [appears] in this
 way. (129)
 Therefore Dvaitiṣyana and others describe in various places (*deśeṣu*) in
 their own Śāstras the notion that something belongs to oneself as [equivalent
 to] death, for it produces division. (130)
 In this way, even in the highest reality, cognitions (*samvīdāḥ*) that are caused
 under the influence of limiting adjuncts, which are the activity of time, appear
 as 'then' etc. (131)
 And in this [highest reality], because it is always replete,²⁸ everything is also
 in everything. Otherwise this entirety would not be full, since division would
 be possible. (132)
 Therefore, on account of its fullness in the all-sustaining light of Bhairava,
 the sense of the Śāstra [on the level] of Śiva (*sāmbhava*) is fivefold. By subor-
 dinating the level of power and soul, this [God] emphasizes the highest deity
 [of speech] in his own self. (133-134ab)
 So it is that when he wishes to emit the objects [i.e. the world], before
 (*pūrvam*) [reaching] the condition, in which he creates,²⁹ he has [already]
 experienced a state in which the mass of bliss has been stirred (*ucchallita*).
 (134cd-135ab)
 But in the state where he is a creator, when he is absorbed in the emission
 [of the world] and (*upai*) is about to become emptied of the mass of bliss that
 is his full consciousness, he is (*vartamānah*) completely (*trāra*)³⁰ filled with
 intentness (*dhīrat*) to emit, which is part of his power of bliss; he was full of
 the mass of his own powers; and he will have exhausted his power. Thus (*iti*)
 the highest deity [Śiva] is manifest in his creative state as the sentence that is
 diversified threefold [i.e. into past, present and future]. (135cd-138ab)
 [Opp:] But how can past and future exist together in an aspect of present
 time? Surely you understand that they are also independent entities³¹ and [that]
 the past, as well as the future are divided from the present.³² (138cd-139)

²⁷ Among several possibilities this is, as pointed out by Prof. Torretta, the most convincing way
 to construe this verse.
²⁸ Lit., "Because its form is only full."
²⁹ Lit., "the state of being a creator"
³⁰ See APFE (1986), s.v.
³¹ Lit., "Do you understand them to be something independent."
³² Lit., "are separated from present time as a limit."

uktam hi bhāvabhāso yāḥ kālāḥ sa kālānātmakaḥ || 153 ||
 svasamīdīśmīsaṃsphāro bhāvābhāvaḥ sa nāparaḥ |
 tasmāt svarāśmīsaṃrodhāvararuddhādhvamaṇḍalāḥ || 154 ||
 kālagrāsāṅkarasiko jāyate khecarāḥ svayam |
 tad uktam paramesena tantre śrīdāmārābhīdhe || 155 ||
 niruddhya rāśmīcakram svamī pītvānīritam anutamam |
 kalobhayaaparicchīnīse vartamāne sukhi bhavet || 156 ||
 rodho 'pi nāma nātasmin saṅkocaparivarjite |
 tadabhāvan na viśphāro grāsarptiḥ tathātra ke || 157 ||
 kṛpīktānītyā saṃrodhasphāragrāsādi bhasate |
 na tadābhāsane cānyad vastu viśvatra kimcana || 158 ||
 ity aloṃ khecarīcakragoṣṭhiyālapena bhūyaś |
 ko vāhīnavagupte 'smiṇ yogaḥ saṃvedanakrame || 159 ||
 prakṛtam brīmālī devīvisṛṣṭāś cīrasamvīdāḥ |
 yāvāt tāvad tad ūrdhvordhvaṃ sroto yad bhēdavarjitam || 160 ||
 saurabhargaśikḥāḍīni tataḥ śāstrāṇi tenire |
 uktam bhargasīkhāyām ca devena parameśthinā || 161 ||
 ūrdhvasrotodbhavaṃ jñānam idaṃ tai paramaṃ priye |
 paramadhyaminordhvordhvasamvīdrūpābhīdhāyina || 162 ||
 śānavaktraṇṭryātaiḥ siddhāntāḥ bhedaṃ ādiśai |
 atāpū pūrvābhedaṃsvyāśmīśrībhāvācīritāḥ || 163 ||
 vijñānasamṛpadas tāṃs tāṃs tanvate śāstravibhramān |

153a bhāva- 154b bhāvābhāvah; bhāvābhāvaḥ J. 155a grāsa
 155d dāmas; bhāmān J. 156c paricchīnīse; paricchīnī pābe to
 157c viśpharo; upādeḥ. 158c cakra; cakraṇ J. 159c vāh-
 160a cānyad vastu; cānyā J. 162a codbhavaṃ; ubhavaṃ J. 163c anbhā-
 163d śāstravibhramān; śāstravibhramān J.

For it is taught that time, which is the appearance of the world, is [*śūn* ... and
 the vibration (*saṃsphāraḥ*) of the rays of one's own consciousness that is pro-
 jecting (*kaṭam*) the world. The absence of the world is [also] it [i.e. time], it is
 nothing else. Therefore one who has restrained all the [six] orders (*adhvani*) by
 restraining the rays of his own [consciousness], who is completely immersed in
 the devouring of time, spontaneously (*svayam*) becomes "one who moves in
 the void [of consciousness]"; (153cd–155ab)
 This has been said by Siva (*parames*) in the *Śrīdāmāratantra*: "After immo-
 bilizing one's circle of rays and tasting the supreme nectar he should dwell in
 bliss within the present that is not divided from both past and future." (155cd–
 156)
 Even the so-called restraint [of the rays] does not exist in this [present]
 which is free from contraction. As this is absent, there is no vibration [of
 the *rodhīcakra*] in it, and how could there be [subsequent] devouring and
 contentment. (157)
 But in the manner described [above] restraint, appearance, devouring etc. *ap-
 pear*. And there is no other reality in the world than appearance in this way.
 (158)
 But enough of this long narration of the [secret] discourse about the *khecarī-
 rakra*; or what is its use (*ka vogaḥ*) for the process of perception, which is hid-
 den ever new [i.e. again and again]? (159)
 So let us deal with our topic. When (*vān*) the manifold perceptions are emit-
 ted by the goddess, they form the stream that is higher than the "upper" [stream]
 and is free from duality.³⁵ From it Śāstras like the *Saurabhargasīkhā* are pro-
 duced. (160–161ab)
 And the supreme God teaches in the *Bhargasīkhā*: "O Beloved, this is the
 knowledge, that stems from the higher stream: *that* is the supreme [knowl-
 edge]."
 With the word 'supreme', which expresses the form of consciousness *above*
 the higher stream, he taught that there is a difference between [this highest form
 of the Śāstra and] the Siddhānta, which issued from the *īśāna* face. (161cd–
 163ab)
 Even here, [when] the riches of knowledge become manifold by mingling
 with parts of earlier divisions, they produce an astonishing multitude of Śās-
 tras.³⁶ (163cd–164ab)

³⁵ Lit.: "Then (*vān*) this is the stream which is without duality."

³⁶ "Astonishing multitude" tries to catch both senses of *vibhramā* that are implied here.

tadupādhrivasād bhedo bhāraṇe bhāvasaṃbhavāt ||201||
 na nāsmannanubhūmāy upārodhum ivārhatā |
 tasyāṅgī vikāśino bhāvāḥ santīti hy atisāhasan | ||202||
 devaḥ sa eva viśvātmā tatāhārūpeṇa bhāsate |
 nirpādhet abhinnaṣya bhinnam aupādhibhāsanam ||203||
 nanv ittham tad asatyam syāt katham satyaṃ tad eva hi |
 nathāvabhāsanād anyat kva kiṃ satyaṃ nirūpyatām ||204||
 nanv evam svapnasaṃśāraḥ kiṃ satyaṃ kīrtv asau kila |
 arbhīṣarthakriyāvandhyo 'satyo vyavahṛtaḥ param ||205||
 etac cāgre prapāñcena yuktiyuktam nirūpyate |
 tasmat unmeśasaktir yā pūrvam āśīd abhedinī ||206||
 bhāvanmeśasvarūpāsau yātā tatpurusaṣṭhiim |
 yad abhinnaṃ tad agrāhyam vac ca grāhakaṃ śvaram ||207||
 adbhutā tat sthitaṃ grāhyam bhedāt tadgrāhakaṃ bhidat |
 puruṣādhyam tataḥ prakṛtaṃ śreṣṭh prārambhayogataḥ ||208||
 susphuṭapratyabhijñānān mukhyaṃ vaktraṃ ca bhānyate |
 eva evātra viśarabhāvasthīti vi ghātakaṃ ||209||
 nānāruggrahasamghāta viśādi paricareyate |
 anekayuktidāhavyādhisamśāntasusthitāḥ ||210||
 āra susphuṭatām yānu bhāvā bhedakavṛtiyab |
 bhāvatyaṃ eva yat sarvaṃ tat tv idaṃ pūrvajam mukham ||211||
 sarvatas ca guṇotkarṣād īśānasyordhvavakratā |
 dikkālākalanāśānye na tu digbhedakalpanāḥ ||212||
 ya śāsmād guṇotkrṣṭa iti cordhvo bhaviṣyati |

[A:] We do not even have to consider⁴² the idea (nī) that [only] because the world can exist in Bhārava, limitations through objects (*tad*) cause division. For it is brazen (*atisāhasam*) to say that changing objects [could] be silent [in Śiva]. (201cd–202)

[According to our doctrine] it is this God who is the self of the world [; because he] appears in this form. He, who is without limitations and undivided, causes⁴³ the manifestation of limitations as different [from him]. (203)

[Opp:] If this is so, then this [appearance of limitations] will be unreal; how can it be real [at the same time]?⁴⁴ [A:] Nowhere has anything else than the appearance [of God] in this form been described as real.⁴⁵ (204)

[Opp:] If it were so, why would the world of dreams be real [on one hand], but on the other hand (*param*) be said to be unreal, as it is considered (*kila*) incapable of producing a desired effect. [A:] This will be set forth with arguments and in detail later. (205–206ab)

Therefore the power of *nimneṣa* [= *cāid*], which was not divided [from the other powers] before, attains the state of Tatpuruṣa by becoming the awakening⁴⁶ of the world. (206cd–207ab)

That which is undivided is imperceptible; that which perceives, [namely] the *īśānātma*, exists now as perceptible, because of the division. Its perceiver is called *puruṣa* because of this division (*bhidat*). And it is called primary face, because it is connected to the beginning of creation [and] because it is clearly recognizable. (207cd–209ab)

Therefore diverse ailments, seizure by planets (*graha*), violent death (*samghāta*), poison etc. are described here as an obstacle to the continuance of the state of expansion. (209cd–210ab)

Once their ailments have been destroyed by various means and they are settled (*saṃśānta*) and firmly (*sa-*) established in existence, the objects become clearly perceptible as [entities] that exist only in division. The whole nature of existence is this first-horn face. (210cd–211)

Because [his] qualities are superior in every respect, the upper face is that of Śāṇa. For in him, who is free from the action (*kalanā*) of direction and time, no concepts of spatial divisions exist. And [as is taught in MVT 2.60] “he who has superior qualities than someone else” will be higher. (212–213ab)

⁴² Lit. “it can not [or: does not deserve to] climb the plane of my mind, even! a little.”

⁴³ Lit. “has.”

⁴⁴ Lit. “how can the same [appearance] be real?”

⁴⁵ Lit. “What apart from appearance in this form has where been described as real?”

⁴⁶ Lit. “in the form of the awakening.”

1. 201d bhāraṇe bhāva: bhāraṇībhāva J.; 202a bhāvan: bhāva
 2. 202b eva śāśmād: 202d śāśmād J.; 203d upādhibhāsa: upādhibhāsa
 3. 204cd–209b For these verses we have frequent C
 4. 207d ca grāhakaṃ: cāgrāhakaṃ K;
 5. 209b mukhyaṃ: mukhyaṃ
 6. 211d tat tv idaṃ: tat tv idaṃ J;
 7. 212d bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 8. 213a śāśmād: śāśmād J;
 9. 213b bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 10. 213c bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 11. 213d bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 12. 213e bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 13. 213f bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 14. 213g bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 15. 213h bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 16. 213i bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 17. 213j bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 18. 213k bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 19. 213l bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 20. 213m bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 21. 213n bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 22. 213o bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 23. 213p bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 24. 213q bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 25. 213r bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 26. 213s bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 27. 213t bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 28. 213u bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 29. 213v bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 30. 213w bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 31. 213x bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 32. 213y bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 33. 213z bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 34. 214a bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 35. 214b bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 36. 214c bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 37. 214d bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 38. 214e bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 39. 214f bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 40. 214g bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 41. 214h bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 42. 214i bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 43. 214j bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 44. 214k bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 45. 214l bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 46. 214m bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 47. 214n bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 48. 214o bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 49. 214p bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 50. 214q bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 51. 214r bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 52. 214s bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 53. 214t bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 54. 214u bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 55. 214v bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 56. 214w bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 57. 214x bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 58. 214y bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 59. 214z bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 60. 215a bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 61. 215b bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 62. 215c bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 63. 215d bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 64. 215e bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 65. 215f bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 66. 215g bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 67. 215h bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 68. 215i bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 69. 215j bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 70. 215k bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 71. 215l bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 72. 215m bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 73. 215n bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 74. 215o bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 75. 215p bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 76. 215q bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 77. 215r bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 78. 215s bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 79. 215t bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 80. 215u bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 81. 215v bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 82. 215w bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 83. 215x bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 84. 215y bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 85. 215z bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 86. 216a bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 87. 216b bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 88. 216c bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 89. 216d bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 90. 216e bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 91. 216f bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 92. 216g bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 93. 216h bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 94. 216i bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 95. 216j bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 96. 216k bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 97. 216l bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 98. 216m bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 99. 216n bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;
 100. 216o bhaviṣyati: bhaviṣyati J;

ārmashanāni idam vāta vyūtpādya hi jñātaḥ sa ca |
 svāpno hi bhūmiḥ karmāṅghrakṣayaṁ saukamaryatā ||226||
 126. svāpno hi bhūmiḥ karmāṅghrakṣayaṁ saukamaryatā ||226||
 127. svāpno hi bhūmiḥ karmāṅghrakṣayaṁ saukamaryatā ||227||
 128. svāpno hi bhūmiḥ karmāṅghrakṣayaṁ saukamaryatā ||228||
 129. svāpno hi bhūmiḥ karmāṅghrakṣayaṁ saukamaryatā ||229||
 130. svāpno hi bhūmiḥ karmāṅghrakṣayaṁ saukamaryatā ||230||
 131. svāpno hi bhūmiḥ karmāṅghrakṣayaṁ saukamaryatā ||231||
 132. svāpno hi bhūmiḥ karmāṅghrakṣayaṁ saukamaryatā ||232||
 133. svāpno hi bhūmiḥ karmāṅghrakṣayaṁ saukamaryatā ||233||
 134. svāpno hi bhūmiḥ karmāṅghrakṣayaṁ saukamaryatā ||234||
 135. svāpno hi bhūmiḥ karmāṅghrakṣayaṁ saukamaryatā ||235||
 136. svāpno hi bhūmiḥ karmāṅghrakṣayaṁ saukamaryatā ||236||

This is a crucial point [of our system] and people should be made proficient in it. If their heart [i.e. consciousness] is ploughed like soil by the mass of *karma*, it becomes very soft and is therefore strewn with plantains (*kandala*), whose sprouts are the endless concepts stemming from the seed of *mūṣi*. [These plantains] are tainted by the habit of expression that is caused by the wrong notion of dividedness. (226–227)
 As long as this [ground of consciousness] is not destroyed again and again by knowledge, like [soil is destroyed] by a massive forest conflagration, duality grows again and again for him. (228)
 When duality is destroyed by sharp reasoning, just like a tree is cut by sharp axes, [a reasoning] which is tempered by real knowledge like the axes are tempered by fire, it does not grow again. (229)
 Thus when God remains inside the aspect [of his nature] that is deep sleep, the objects, although existent, become virtually non-existent, like a *kupittha*-tree in the netherworld. (230)
 Because of this separation (*vibhāgataḥ*) only such [an aspect] of his knowledge that is full of indifference [and] without designation or foundation unfolded [into the Sastras] in this [western face of Śiva]. (231)
 Those who live in burning grounds and wear garlands of human skulls for decoration and whose sphere is that of the assemblage of spirits are turned away from us. (232)

Every enjoyment ends in disgust
 for the "I" experiences, the body is nothing⁴⁸
 but skin and bones, never is there an essence in it,
 not even in the smallest part. (233)

By constant practice in this manner they attain to the highest perfection of detachment in every moment and close their eyes [i.e. die] annihilated through it [i.e. detachment]. (234)

"What is this", in this way the sense activities flow forth even in pain. "It is so", in this way they generally become detached even from the pleasant. (235)

And also [in the Yogasūtras]: "One, whose mind is in control when he is detached from all desires [or the flood of seen [i.e. worldly] and heard [in scripture as a reward for following it] objects, [experiences] the detachment from the *gunas* [only] afterwards through the knowledge of the soul." (236)

⁴⁸ Lat.: "What is this body? Only skin..." *śūṣa* here perhaps indicates "dislike" or "corrupt". Cf. APH (1986), xv.

namy akāṇḍe 'pi prechānah kīnced yadī na kṛpyate |
 'kmi akāṇḍe bhoḍakandabhedhukam/ighatāvadhau ||237||
 tanu samveid iyaṁ suddhā svalbhavān eva cet katham |
 asnebhya 'pi bhogebhyaṁ rasat sphūṇyate'aram ||238||
 namy avimsrīstīlā cābhānābh keḍāhuā gatah |
 alam va buddhiyupatābhāit ukam apy etad heyaṭe ||239||
 svabharvad eva samyaktiḥ prakāśaparamārthikā |
 svavabhasayogena bhātūti hi vipsaḍetam ||240||
 atas ca samyado deṣya vīśessam bhāṣamapalāḥ |
 cetamāy evocchalatvam kmi kham dātādāyī jāyate ||241||
 vadapi paramasānasaktyo bheda 'vabhasyate |
 tadapi samyad bhavesu dhāvatī vīcēyate ||242||
 yathā loṣṭabhrāḍy alasyāsakam bhaviyasthūy |
 dharāṁ buddhimahatyaḥ samirannutakhātātām ||243||
 yath eva nūṁpeyam samvī evocchalitā kramā |
 samvīdrūpasāṁyām bhavān evānuḍḍāvātī ||244||
 nyūṁpyatā tatā caitat kenāpi paramēśīnā |
 annam tadagapanyam kaḥ pravāṇyātūṁ kṣamāḥ ||245||
 pūṁpūne pūnas tasmā pravalāḥ sarvānūkhāḥ |
 nam kmi kamsēd evetthāṁ sāsa svanyāter baḥā ||246||
 tūṁ m dhāv, tī tae casya rāḡatattvīmkaṁ vapuḥ |
 apu ca tūṁ rā gāḥāsa eva sa dhāryatām ||247||
 tūṁ m tū rāḡo 'stu kī 'py anyārīśanāimakaḥ |
 tūṁ m eṭ kāmān nāmā sa kūrāpi vīrāyate ||248||
 tūṁ pakṛta 'vaya n vadāḥ saṁgatīm āgatāḥ |
 tūṁ eva, sa sa vataḥ saṁkucatsititib ||249||
 tūṁ pūṁpyeḍhyo bhūgyebhyaḥ dehatō bhujah |
 tūṁ tūṁ, kāmā mahaḥpralāyabhāḡ īva ||250||
 tūṁ pūṁ, sa dāsa sāmāntikī yataḥ |

[Opp:] We would like to ask something unexpectedly, if you permit. . .
 [237a] intelligible. (237)
 In this case, if it is true that this consciousness is pure by its very nature, then
 how is it possible that it has this extreme desire for impure enjoyments sponta-
 neously (*rasat*)? (238)
 [A:] Where has your pride in not forgetting [what was taught before] gone
 now? Or [rather] enough of these [objections everyone's] intelligence must re-
 vive! Although I have taught it before, I shall teach again. (239)
 By its very nature consciousness, which is intimately light, shines as (so-
 phisticated) the appearance of the world. This has been stated in great detail. (240)
 How could therefore the fact that the goddess who is consciousness appears
 (myself) in the whole sphere of the world only in her own self become a cause
 for division? (241)
 It is described (*vīcēyate*) [in this way] that every time the power of the Lord
 causes the manifestation of duality, consciousness flows into objects. (242)
 Just as a drop of earth, a lake, a flame, breath and the space inside a pot be-
 come [respectively] earth [itself], the ocean, the great fire, air and endless space.
 [In the same way] consciousness as knowledge (*mīti*), being projected from it-
 self (*svocchalit*), gradually follows the objects that are congruent to this form
 of consciousness. (243–244)
 This has been explained by the indescribable Lord in the following way:
 "Who is able to cause water to flow out from a tank if [its level] is low? If [the
 tank] is, however, [over]full, streams [flow out] in all directions." (245–246a)
 [Opp:] But does consciousness (*sa*) through the force of its own determina-
 tion (*mīti*), thus flow into certain [objects] only? [If it does so,] then its form
 is that of the *tanu* 'desire' (*rāga*). (246c–247ab)
 [A:] [I concede that] it may bear an appearance of *rāga* in this manner. There
 may be some kind of *rāga* in the conscious self, in the form of being coloured
 by another. (247c) 248ab)
 [Opp:] If this is the case, then how could consciousness ever become de-
 tached from something? (248c)
 [A:] Ah, we have come back to the main topic of our discussion. For when the
 power of consciousness (*cit*) has become completely contracted, it gradually
 becomes emptied (*simyā*) of the means of experience, the objects of experience,
 the experiencing (*bhūyibh*) body, from experience [itself] and (*tatā*) the subject
 of experience, as it entering the great dissolution [at the end of the universe], for
 the state of destruction which is [thus] produced is that of Rudra. (249–251ab)

sadyojātaś ca yad rudraḥ puruṣaś cāśvarāṭmakah ||251||
 śānān sadāśivo deva īśānaś ceti gīyate |
 vānir vāmah kapy aghoraḥ in caṭṭad bhaviṣyati ||252||
 anāhasthasarvasaktir enakaikasvāpi brhannāḥ |
 brahmāny etāni kathyante bhāttvād viśvabrmhapaḥ ||253||
 tadanyasaktiudrekāṃse hy ata eva vivakṣite |
 pratyekam aṣṭi brahmāḍāhetupaṇekakayogitā ||254||
 sāiva cāśtreṣu bhedenā teṣu teṣu pratyavate |
 ātas ca sadyojāte 'smiṇ mukhēṣ raudrādaś sṭhītā ||255||
 sā ca sanikocārūpī etdyikāse bhaviṣyati |
 yall' nau brahmaviṣṇavaṃśau tenādhahkurate baḥt ||256||
 vāstabhāvanayitvādidāḥ rudrādhidevatā |
 bhānaprameyeti śrīmadutpalena nyarūpyata ||257||
 āto 'pi bhedaṭannātre sanikocaṇi yad upāgataḥ |
 vyatimilitē bhoktrbhogāy iha sphuṭam ||258||
 ātam iya tad viśvam atra sadyo 'vabhāṣate
 sadyo rūpādām tena sūnyasamvedanātmakam ||259||
 sūnyapadasyāntar yāvat sa eva vivikṣati |
 deṣṭvā t svayam bodhe viśvam procechalati sṭhutam ||260||
 seṣa... jñānaśaktir vikāśinī |
 vikāśa dīdhāmi jñatvam upapāditam ||261||
 deṣṭvā sūnyāpava vikāśo viśvam eva tat
 upapāditvāsvānīvaśāntirbharah ||262||
 āp... dy... śān veti svapnapadābhidhān |
 ... sṭhītā eva tu sā tatāḥ ||263||
 ... d dhi v jñānamātrakam |
 ... no bhiedena jāyate ||264||
 ... pratyekam bahubhedatā
 ... sṭhūrūpeṇa bhāsanam ||265||

... 251b naikaikasvāpi: naikaikasvāpī
 ... 254b atā: eta J., 254b vāst:
 ... 255d 257ab In fragment G. 256c līnā: tad J. G.
 ... 257b devatā G. devatā K. J. 257c J. and K insert be-
 ... 258a 'pi om G. (but illegible insertion.) 258a bhō:
 ... 258c tat: yata J. G. 259a viśvam b:
 ... 260b vivikṣati: vivikṣan J. 261a jñāt:
 ... 263c tatā: J. 263c atā: atra J. 263c vāst:
 ... 265d rūpeṇa: rūpāna J.

For Sadyojāta is Rudra, Taipurusa is Īśvara and the holy Sadāśiva is called
 [āna. Vāmadeva is Viṣṇu, and Aghora is Brahmā. This will be [taught later],
 (251cd-252)
 As they are internally of the nature of all the powers, they nourish each of
 them. Therefore they are called *brahman*, [and] because of their magnitude and
 their nourishing [of] the universe. (253)
 When [Śiva] therefore wishes to express the aspect of predominance (*udre-*
kāṃse) of one of these (*tadanya*) powers, each [power] is connected with [one
 of the] five causes, i.e. Brahmā etc. This [connection] is described in different
 scriptures in detail. (254-255ab)
 And therefore the state of Rudra is dominant in this [face of] Sadyojāta. This
 state, although contraction by nature, will exist in the expansion of conscious-
 ness; [it is a state] in which the aspects of Brahmā and Viṣṇu are latent; he there-
 fore (*tena*) subdues them forcefully. (255cd-256)
 Rudra is the presiding deity of the state of absence of objects etc. The holy
 Utpaladeva taught [this] with the words "[Brahmā and Viṣṇu reside in the flow
 of] differentiated objects of perception" etc. (257)
 When he, although he is 'born' (*jāta*) into subtle duality, contracts, the sub-
 ject and object of experience certainly disappear in him (*iha*). In this state the
 universe [then] suddenly (*tsad-a-*) seems to be unborn (*ajāta*). Therefore the
 state of Sadyojāta is one in which emptiness is experienced. (258-259)
 Therefore, when God wishes to enter into the state of void, he himself knows
 everything that exists, as soon as knowledge manifests (*bodhe*... *procechalati*);
 that is the Lord's unfolding power of knowledge. (260-261ab)
 The universe is [thus] dissolved into the light of consciousness that unfolds
 in these two (*tayor*) [the subject and object of experience]; this is (*tat*) the un-
 folding of the consciousness that is empty. (261cd-262ab)
 For, to explain, one who is completely overcome⁴⁹ by the rest [experienced
 in] deep sleep, perceives different elements like for instance a house or a mar-
 ket, which are designated by the word "dream". (262cd-263ab)
 Therefore this is not creation, but merely continuance in the same way
 (*tatāḥ*). For it is only a knowledge of things created earlier [in the waking
 state]. And in this way the state of dream is produced from the form of the
 waking state by division. (263cd-264)
 But it will be described later that each of the states of waking etc. has many
 subdivisions, and it is therefore appropriate [for them] to appear as creation.
 (265)

⁴⁹ Lit. "full of the influence"

[illegible]

Therefore the pervading Lord fits the objects with his own knowledge and
conversion in to give up the state of indifference [by] pervading them [31, 266]
This is the opening of the power of knowledge. The objects, which become
the continuance of this knowledge, attain to fullness when their splendour un-
folds [267]
The highest degree of contraction certainly exists in the state of Sadyojāta.
[In] the nature of those things never reaches steadiness. [268]
For how can there be any [limited] existence like being and non-being, ma-
terial and immaterial [things], non-blue and blue etc. without rising into con-
sciousness? [269]
For this is what the teacher Ītāla said: It is proven that there is no difference
between the natures of existent and non-existent as well as *(rāda)* between ma-
terial and immaterial [things] (270)
Therefore this God is called Vama, because he emits his power of knowl-
edge (*brahmā*), [first] by emitting into all directions the animating conscious-
ness (*akṣhīpamāṇa*) that is basked by bliss and has created the state
of own and nether by the appearance of its mass of knowledge, [then] by the
desire to appropriate everything into his conscious self through the nature of
consciousness alone. [271 272]
But even when he, through the increase of his own power of knowledge, be-
stows his nature on the objects, he, although in reality wishing to appropriate
them, brings about the restriction of their differentiation (*bhida*). Therefore
this God is crooked (*vama*) with respect to the continuance of division. (273
274)
In this [stream] the knowledge that is produced is accordingly (*ādṛg*)
one, from which beauty streams out. What we call beauty is [in fact]

51 Lit.: "the animation of consciousness"

51 Lat.: "of such a nature [that]".

⁵² Lit.: "This manifested (*pratyakha*) state (*avasthā*) is the emergence in its (*itā*) utmost essence."

essence

277. ... kim nāsa ca bhāvayāt yogavīt
 278. ... te sastre narakto ranjayed iti 279.
 280. ... kāmānādhyaśham kāmānkuśaputikṛtam
 281. ... nādhaye kāmān kāmān kāmān vājaye 280
 282. ... svikartum icchaya tadacchādanavogatah
 283. ... sadhayate kāmā kāmāntam idam yatah 281
 284. ... parame svātmanā adhyāśva śhairyam añjāś
 285. ... sambodhakalāsamāhādanakramāt 282
 286. ... mārka sādhanam karmakaravēna bhāśate
 287. ... tmas ddhaya v-ktiyā tv anayaiva nijodaye 283
 288. ... purāṣa kām deham vyāpya viśvam prakarsati
 289. ... vā kamataṭ vasya prakāśmītyā yatah 284
 290. ... cakreś idam gopyam kim vā na prakāśikṛtam
 291. ... pratyaya devah procchalitātumakāh 285
 292. ... hī sakūr vikāśyaiva pravartate
 293. ... prāy vikāś yāś ca prāvṛtad vibhuh 286
 294. ... kārānā bhāvaś svātmanā udreçya vartate
 295. ... vā bhūta iva bhāśate 287
 296. ... t- ... etah prameçecchāvidikriyāh
 297. ... k- ... vedy apī pratibhāśate 288
 298. ... t- ... t- ... sva bhavet kutah
 299. ... n- ... anākālā yatah 289
 300. ... i- ... kankrantagocarah
 301. ... t- ... uccātanādayah 290
 302. ... p- ... t- ... kriyāh sthītiāh

What does he who knows [this] Yoga not attract, and what does he not create by imagination? Therefore it is taught in the Śāstra that one should be desirous to create desire in others. (279)

That which is in desire, in the centre of desire, or opened by the hook of desire, one shall obtain by desire. Willingly (*kāmān*) one shall unite desires with desire. (280)

Desire is the wish to appropriate. With [desire] as a cover the desirous attains everything, for this [*viśvam*], which is subject to the control⁵³ of desire, having

For the world [*viśvam*], which is subject to the control⁵³ of desire, having suddenly acquired stability in the highest self, appears as a 'slave', as it is gradually covered by the power (*kalā*) of knowledge that appears from it [i.e. the self]. (282–283ab)

For [*vyāhī*] through this method, which is proved by individual [experience], the life force – as soon as it arises – pervades the subtle body and attracts everything through the manifestation of reality, [i.e.] the reality of desire. If anything is to be kept secret in the circles of Siddhas, it is this.⁵⁴ (283cd–285ab)

After emerging from the blissful emptiness God appears [*procchalitātuma-* *kuhi*] as present (*vartanantah*) and becomes active merely by unfolding his own powers. (285cd–286ab)

That in which he wishes to enter, from which the pervading Lord brought all powers into existence, is that state which increases in itself. Therefore God, who is consciousness, appears as if subordinated, but these [powers, i.e.] *ameṣa*, volition (*icchā*), cognition (*vidi*) and action (*kriyā*) appear as active [and therefore dominating]. (286cd–288ab)

For this reason, though, Śiva manifests himself as joined with [these] four powers [i.e. as Tumburu], how can one really count them. (288cd–289ab)

Since the power to uproot the aspect of division from existence lies in the [Aghora face], this practice [of religion] has its scope in super-mundane reality. Because of the diversity of endless powers, the various ritual acts [proper to this *vratas*], like the expulsion [of an enemy] etc., acts which are mainly [a form] of the playful destruction, persist even there. (289cd–291ab)

⁵³ Lit. "good/unknow"

⁵⁴ Lit. "what else is [there, which is] not [automatically] revealed [by that]"

277. All sources, including K₁₀, read a *śāha* after
 278. ... 280b kāmān vājaye 281a kāmān
 282a ... 282d sarmachadana ...
 283a ... 284a prāy vikāś ...
 285a ... 286a prāy vikāś ...
 287a ... 288a ...
 289a ... 290a ...
 291a ... 292a ...

āha bhinnasārūpam tad ekaṃ cety upagamyate ||303||
 sabbhavaḥbhedo bhedaḥety etat tyaktam vratam bhavet |
 nanv anantaṃ sā kriyā mā bhīd ekā kāsthādī kārakam ||304||
 phalam anayatām evam apy astu na hi naḥ kṣatīḥ |
 kriyā hi nāma nāsmākam anyā saktis tv asau yatati ||305||
 saktis ca phalabhīdī|ptyā bhāvāmaivāvibhedatāḥ |
 sāca sakur vibhlor eva sa ca viśvātmavigrahaḥ ||306||
 phalākārakahedena na bhinnā paramārthataḥ |
 svāmany abhinne 'pi vibhor evaṃ bhedāvabhāsanāt ||307||
 kriyāsakur iti proktā yayā kartā mahesvaraḥ |
 namu yat paśavaḥ kuryuḥ katham tad upapadyatām ||308||
 te hi bhedaikagīvatāt kururur bhedavatīṃ kriyām |
 alam etena paśavaḥ katham kuryur iti sphuṭam ||309||
 sa eva svavacacchurmo vādo vandhyākulādivat |
 na hi kumbhakroti kvāpi kadācit kartṛtā bhavet ||310||
 yadi nāsau mahesākhyat kartur avyatrekabhāk |
 namu kiṃ svit kulālena kumbho 'pi kriyate tatātḥ ||311||
 īśasya viśvakartṛve kiṃ paṭe 'pi na kartṛtā |
 yady evam tat kulālena paṭo 'pi kriyate na kim ||312||
 nanv evaṃ sati no kartā ko 'py anya itī karmagām |
 subhāsuhhānān svaphalam kartum kam prati hetutā ||313||
 evaṃ evatad āyusmams tatthāhy evaṃ vijānatām |
 kiṃ cana phalam kvāpi subhāsuhhasamudbhavam ||314||
 rthe 'pye tu na jānanti bhunjate te 'vapaśīlāḥ |
 ta eva s n asamjñam tu nalam ajñānamūlakam ||315||

If (*anā*) it is accepted that one thing can have different natures, then the view that a difference in nature leads to division should be given up. (303cd–304ab)
 [Opp:] If this is so, action would not be one, [but] the causal factors, [i.e.] wood etc., would produce the effect. [A:] Even this might be the case. It does not undermine our position, for action is for us not different [from the does not undermine our position, for action is for us not different] from the causal factors, as it is power, and power becomes⁵⁶ an object by producing a differentiation (*bhīd*) of effects without being [itself] divided (*avibhedatāḥ*). And power belongs to the all-pervading God who has the universe as his body. (304cd–306)

In reality [power] is not divided by the division of causal factors and effects, because the all-pervading God, despite being undivided in himself, causes division to appear in this way. [The power] is taught to be the power of action, [a power] through which Maheśvara becomes an agent. (307–308ab)
 [Opp:] But how can we account for that which bound souls would produce? For they, being completely dependent on division, can cause only differentiated action. (308cd–309ab)

[A:] Enough of that! Your argument [i.e. the enquiry into] 'how the souls would produce' is clearly (*sphuṭam*) self-contradictory, like, for instance, "the son of a barren woman." (309cd–310ab)

For nowhere and never is it possible for the potter [in the well-known example for creation] to become the agent [of the pot] unless he is indistinguishable from the [real] agent called Maheśa [i.e. Śiva]. (310cd–311ab)

[Opp:] But in what sense?⁵⁷ is the pot made also by the potter? Given the fact that God is the universal agent, is he not the agent [in the production] of a cloth as well. If this is correct, would it not then be true that the cloth too is produced by the potter. (311cd–312)

If this is correct, there would be no other agent [than God]. As a consequence (*hi*), there would be no one for whom good and bad actions could be the cause for a [future] fruition.⁵⁸ (313)

[A:] You are right, Sir! For you should know that there is never any effect, which is produced by good or bad [actions]. (314)

But those who do not understand it in this way experience [the effects] without [ever] realizing this. For what is called *karma* is [actually] an impurity (*malā*), which has ignorance as its source. (315)

⁵⁶ Lit.: "is of the nature of"

⁵⁷ Lit.: "how" (*kim* *svit*).

⁵⁸ Lit.: "With regard to whom (*kam* *prati*) would good and bad actions be the cause for the production (*kartum*) of their fruit?"

303b kṣatīḥ: kṣatīḥ Ks. 306a phalabāt: phalabāt
 303cd-304ab: bhinnasārūpam (comp. TORILLAS); bhinnasārūpam (bhinnasārūpam) Ks. 303d it (comp.)
 304a saktis: saktis J. 312b paṭe: paṭe J. 311cd-312. The
 312cd-313ab: saktis: saktis J. 312cd, 311cd, 312ab. 313c subhāsuhhānān: subhāsuhhānān
 314a karman: karman J. K. 313d kam: kam J. 313d karman: karman
 315a karman: karman J. 315c karman: karman J., karman K.

evad eva... anyasya kṛtī saṁvittimātrakam |
 satmanasyate hy akatāram kartṛtvānupapattitah ||316||
 cāsvanopadhikam | hy asya yat tat kartṛtvam ucyate |
 at advan apayed asmai cidādhikyaprasaṅgalah ||317||
 prakṛteḥ kartṛā pūṁsi manū nāmopacyate |
 et... anyaspathapatar vṛtā jēgyate ghe ||318||
 upacaro hi no vastutahvatam pratipadyate |
 vyapadesah param tādṛg vastuśūnyo 'stu tāvatā ||319||
 vyapadesah kavahmtvavapadeso 'pi mānavah |
 humanāśkāśāśrīvātthasirāpabab ||320||
 drāśtūḥ pūṁsas ca na drāṣṭro prakṛtīb paṛigīyate |
 na cānyo 'stu varako 'taḥ kartṛbhāvopacārah ||321||
 kim ca pravojanam tasya kartṛvavyavahārajam |
 vyapadesas tū nāvastu parivartayitum kṣamah ||322||
 ye 'py atmanam nayaścidah kartāram samupāgaman |
 te 'pi prāṇam imam tavad asmākam pratibhāṛpitam ||323||
 kim vaitṛlokaśāśiddhakarṭṛtvam karmayogataḥ |
 spandāt na tad vibhau spandabhīne samupapadyate ||324||
 tanu bhānam cikīrṣa ca yatnas ceti guṇatrayam |
 samavartī yad ātrāsya tat kartṛtvam udāhṛtam ||325||
 tthan bhāmatinām dhr vipratābhīyeta vañcakaib |
 dāraka api vā vidyur na samvedanavarjītaḥ ||326||
 t, tra gṛhanam na kartṛtvam sarvatrāṣṭy eva tad yataḥ |
 uchayatavā api prāyāḥ saṁstah sarvasya sarvataḥ ||327||
 kurubhākam grhābhāvaparitūpitacetanāḥ |
 manā rechān sayatino 'pi kim kuryān nāmanā gṛham ||328||
 manū kartum na jānātu tatāḥ kartum na cecchāt |
 t... nāt kartum na yataḥ tad gṛham kurutām katham ||329||

anyasya: dmanatvato J; K, abhauṇṇatvato J, 316c akatāram: karatāram
 atman J; K, 317c apayed: arayed J, 319b tadavap: tadavah
 at: ab, nare ke tah J; K, (rare in K), 323a ye: yo J, 323a nayaśchā: nayaśchā
 k: k, J, 323c manū idam J, 325c sama: manū J, 325d kartṛtvam
 m: F, 326c vidyur: vidyūm J, 326d varjītaḥ (em): e varjām K,
 am chah K, 329c na: ca J, h J; K.

Some accept this [but] maintain that something which is only consciousness cannot be an agent, because it is not proven that its nature is that of an agent [They] say that the 'nature of the agent' is something that is more than [just] the nature of consciousness. (316–317ab)

Then, as a consequence of being more than [i.e. different from] consciousness, [the nature of the agent] should receive [the attribute] of being material. [Opp:] Is perhaps (*tuamā*) the nature of an agent [that actually] pertains to *prakṛti* metaphorically used for the individual self? (317cd–318ab)

[A:] This [doctrine] which is obstinately asserted by those in [their] house[s] who have swerved from the path of logic, is nonsense, because a metaphorical attribution of a quality cannot become the reality of a thing: such a [metaphoric] representation is entirely (*param*) bare of the [denoted] reality. For this reason (*taivāt*) a person cannot remove the coldness caused by the wind in a snow shower, even if it is metaphorically called fiery. (318cd–320)

And it is not taught that the *purusa* as a perceiver has a perceiving *prakṛti* [as his active counterpart]. There is no other [reality] below him (*varako 'taḥ*) that could have the nature of an agent metaphorically. (321)

Furthermore the use of the [word *purusa*] stems from [the necessity] of talking about agent-ship. But a name is not capable to transform a non-existent thing [into something existent]. (322)

Even those philosophers, who hold the self to be the actor, [...] (323)

[Opp:] Is the nature of the agent as it is known in the world due [only] to its action? [A:] Then (*tady*) it follows that [the nature of the agent], which is a form of activity, exists in an inactive pervading God. [Opp:] Is it the fact that (*yady*) the three qualities 'knowledge', 'desire to act' and 'effort' inhere in the self (*tatra*) that is called 'nature of an agent.' (324–325)

[A:] In this way the intellect of ignorant persons is led astray by deceivers, nor will children, who are without self-reflection, understand it. (326)

In [your argument] knowledge is not the nature of the agent, because it exists everywhere, and also desire and effort [to act] coexist probably (*prāyah*) everywhere for everyone. (327)

A potter who suffers in his thoughts from having no house – would he not build his own house, if he knew [how to do it], wished and tried it? (328)

[Opp:] But [being a potter] he does not know how to do it, and therefore does not wish to do it, and for this reason makes no effort. This is why he does not build a house. ⁵⁹ (329)

⁵⁹ Lit. "How could he then make a house."

॥ कृत्वा क्लृप्तां पञ्चराशं प्रगृह्यते ॥ 355 ॥
 ॥ एवमुच्यते द्वाविंशत्यक्षरात्मिका उपसृता ॥
 ॥ स्रजस्तुतिर्यन्त्रायामसंस्तवमन्त्रादिकी ॥ 356 ॥
 ॥ त्रिंशत्त्रयस्यैवाहोरात्रिपुष्पापराधमङ्गलसंस्मृतयः ॥ 357 ॥
 ॥ तद्विद्वन्मन्त्रापासुसंघटितगुह्यसमूहः
 ॥ उदाहरन्मन्त्रापासुसंघटितगुह्यसमूहः ॥ 358 ॥
 ॥ स्रजस्तुतिर्यन्त्रायामसंस्तवमन्त्रादिकी ॥
 ॥ स्रजस्तुतिर्यन्त्रायामसंस्तवमन्त्रादिकी ॥ 359 ॥
 ॥ स्रजस्तुतिर्यन्त्रायामसंस्तवमन्त्रादिकी ॥ 360 ॥
 ॥ स्रजस्तुतिर्यन्त्रायामसंस्तवमन्त्रादिकी ॥
 ॥ स्रजस्तुतिर्यन्त्रायामसंस्तवमन्त्रादिकी ॥ 361 ॥
 ॥ स्रजस्तुतिर्यन्त्रायामसंस्तवमन्त्रादिकी ॥
 ॥ स्रजस्तुतिर्यन्त्रायामसंस्तवमन्त्रादिकी ॥ 362 ॥
 ॥ स्रजस्तुतिर्यन्त्रायामसंस्तवमन्त्रादिकी ॥
 ॥ स्रजस्तुतिर्यन्त्रायामसंस्तवमन्त्रादिकी ॥ 363 ॥
 ॥ स्रजस्तुतिर्यन्त्रायामसंस्तवमन्त्रादिकी ॥
 ॥ स्रजस्तुतिर्यन्त्रायामसंस्तवमन्त्रादिकी ॥ 364 ॥
 ॥ स्रजस्तुतिर्यन्त्रायामसंस्तवमन्त्रादिकी ॥
 ॥ स्रजस्तुतिर्यन्त्रायामसंस्तवमन्त्रादिकी ॥ 365 ॥
 ॥ स्रजस्तुतिर्यन्त्रायामसंस्तवमन्त्रादिकी ॥
 ॥ स्रजस्तुतिर्यन्त्रायामसंस्तवमन्त्रादिकी ॥ 366 ॥
 ॥ स्रजस्तुतिर्यन्त्रायामसंस्तवमन्त्रादिकी ॥
 ॥ स्रजस्तुतिर्यन्त्रायामसंस्तवमन्त्रादिकी ॥ 367 ॥
 ॥ स्रजस्तुतिर्यन्त्रायामसंस्तवमन्त्रादिकी ॥
 ॥ स्रजस्तुतिर्यन्त्रायामसंस्तवमन्त्रादिकी ॥ 368 ॥
 ॥ स्रजस्तुतिर्यन्त्रायामसंस्तवमन्त्रादिकी ॥

॥ स्रजस्तुतिर्यन्त्रायामसंस्तवमन्त्रादिकी ॥ 357b paramāra: rāmanā
 ॥ स्रजस्तुतिर्यन्त्रायामसंस्तवमन्त्रादिकी ॥ 358a ananta: ananta
 ॥ स्रजस्तुतिर्यन्त्रायामसंस्तवमन्त्रादिकी ॥ 359a ananta: ananta
 ॥ स्रजस्तुतिर्यन्त्रायामसंस्तवमन्त्रादिकी ॥ 360a ananta: ananta
 ॥ स्रजस्तुतिर्यन्त्रायामसंस्तवमन्त्रादिकी ॥ 361a ananta: ananta
 ॥ स्रजस्तुतिर्यन्त्रायामसंस्तवमन्त्रादिकी ॥ 362a ananta: ananta
 ॥ स्रजस्तुतिर्यन्त्रायामसंस्तवमन्त्रादिकी ॥ 363a ananta: ananta
 ॥ स्रजस्तुतिर्यन्त्रायामसंस्तवमन्त्रादिकी ॥ 364a ananta: ananta
 ॥ स्रजस्तुतिर्यन्त्रायामसंस्तवमन्त्रादिकी ॥ 365a ananta: ananta
 ॥ स्रजस्तुतिर्यन्त्रायामसंस्तवमन्त्रादिकी ॥ 366a ananta: ananta
 ॥ स्रजस्तुतिर्यन्त्रायामसंस्तवमन्त्रादिकी ॥ 367a ananta: ananta
 ॥ स्रजस्तुतिर्यन्त्रायामसंस्तवमन्त्रादिकी ॥ 368a ananta: ananta

The emanation [of the letters of the Sanskrit alphabet], which is taught to start with *a* and end with *ha*, becomes indistinct by resting in the *bindu* [=em]. This opening of the power of action, which has all letters as its garland, exists (*asthūh*) essentially as the articulation of the sound *a-ha-ni* ["*ni*"] when embracing [the whole series]. (355cd–357c)

When (*yāvat*) [the emanation of sound] subsequently (*tatah*) appears (*adha-
 stah*) as equipped with an appearance of the highest replete [consciousness of]
 "I", as devouring all souls from Ananta to Brahmā, as ingesting⁶² the multitude
 of worlds [full of] moving and unmoving beings, and as devouring the group
 of individual souls in the awareness (*rinarsa*) of its own consciousness, then
 (*āvat*) [the powers that are] the listres of Bhairava appropriately (*anacirād*) be-
 come manifold due to the nature of the power of action that has become adorned
 (*carita*) by a diversity which cannot be perceived [completely and is therefore]
 innumerable, [that has] differentiated itself (*-bhīdāmanah*) into mild and fierce
 [aspects] because of an endless number of [ritual] actions, like pacifying etc.,
 and whose perfect presence (*sūstīteḥ*) is displayed by the quantity of [the ob-
 jects that form] her food. (357cd–361)

These powers [that are the lures of Bhairava] are variegated by repeatedly
 becoming empty, full, or both empty and full; [they] are lusting only for de-
 vouring the part of themselves (*svāpisa*) that is called the universe in its state
 as power (*śakti*), and pleased by (*-bhāvīrāḥ*) the eradication of objects that have
 for a long time been fixed in mundane time. [All these powers] spread their re-
 spective mass of rays through their own throbbing (*trispāra*) [and] by exclud-
 ing transcendence (*lokottaravānācāra*) bring about the Śāstras appropriate to
 them. [Śāstras] that attain to fullness, because they are based on the real state
 of *saukalpa*. (362–365ab)

Such a religious practice which appeared first in the transcendent realm, will
 in this world [too] be in a state of non-duality.⁶³ (365cd–366ab)

Here [in our system] exists this great creation of Śiva which is replete and
 inside of which all other [cycles] of creation and resorption take place. (366cd–
 367ab)

It is not proper (*ksamam*) to say that this is the *first* creation, for how could
 something be first etc. in a reality that is without space or time. (367cd–368ab)
 This is the state of waking; it is the principal [state] which partakes of the
 power of consciousness (*anmaya* = *cicchakṛt*). It is Brahmā, whose lotus throne
 consists of the awakening of his own constituent powers. (368cd–369ab)

⁶² Lit. "leading into the cavity of the belly."

⁶³ Lit. "will be one in whose state duality is devoured"

1. tādā rūpāt prabhū brahmam antataḥ ||369||
 2. ma kṛtvā pambhante samivinnāthasya śaktayaḥ
 3. n eva devo 'yam ity ady api śakyate ||370||
 4. a. k. m. apranīyāt āc cidrūpasya mahesitubh
 5. kṣhapāñcadasikāmadhye tādṛm mayā sphuṭam ||371||
 6. kṣtan m āprakṣatvāṃ jñāsya kila lakṣaṇam |
 7. jñād d vīlakṣaṇa bodho yato na parimīyate ||372||
 8. n n svayam etādrḡ devo mānavavirjitah |
 9. jñasvātantṛsyogena kṛtvātmānam carācaram ||373||
 10. tatatparaśāṣṭair udbhūtair udbuḥḥsubhīḥ |
 11. ekak: bh saḍbhīr, ckena trikēna, dvyaṭmakais tribhīḥ ||374||
 12. jñate svaḥhedānām daśanām vīvidhā sthītūḥ
 13. ata eva vicināḥbhyah saṃyidbhyo miśratāvasāt ||375||
 14. cetrāṅy atra svaḥkhye 'pi bheda jñānāni tenire |
 15. vīdī trayāṇām vaktṛāṇām vāmadakṣiṇasamgathīḥ ||376||
 16. t dā pratyekasaktiṣvām bhavīsyadbhavaduḍbhavaiḥ |
 17. sannām trīve rudrabhedas tenāśādaśadhā sthītaḥ ||377||
 18. ekakam pūñcavaktṛam ca vaktṛam yasmat prāgyate |
 19. 'stādaśahūmasya tato lhedair asaṃkhyatā ||378||
 20. parvodditayadīḥ assaḥjñānakarmavicitritāḥ |
 21. rmyante yatas tesu tena no punaruktaḥ ||379||
 22. anyasya eva bodho bhī samācārāḥ kriyākṛmāḥ |
 23. tatra tatra tatnī⁶⁴ prokṣat sarvas tu śivadharmagah ||380||
 24. yatha ekakāñḥ sarve viśrāmyantī mahāmūdhau |
 25. t. tha nānakṛy āh sarvāḥ samvīśisindhau mahesvare | 381||

1. or m. m. brahma J. 370c. etāṃ: etāṃ K. 371c. daśāś. daśaś.
 2. 371c. deva J. 373b. devo nūnavi: dṛgdeva nūna J. 374-375ab. quāda.
 3. 371c. ekakab. ekakāñḥ K. 374d. trikēna: trītena K. trītena J.
 4. 375a. adāśatmakais J. K. adhyātmakāḥ J. 375a. jñate: tad uḥḥam in TAV.
 5. 376a. v. 376 J. K. 375b. vīvidhā: albhavir in TAV 1.18. with uḥḥam as la-
 6. 376d. mīśratā: mīśritā J. 376b. bhinnasya: bhedasya TAV 1.18. bhinnasya J.
 7. 377a. ca vaktṛam om K. 378c. bhinnasya: bhedasya TAV 1.18. 379a. yathāśa. nānakā.
 8. 379a. tatra tatra (mss. om) K. 379a. yathāśa. nānakā.
 9. 380a. punarukta (mss. om) K. 381d. mahesvare: mahesvare J.
 10. 381a. sarva J. 381d. mahesvare: mahesvare J.

These same powers of the Lord of consciousness unfold by taking on the forms starting with Sadāśiva and ending with Brahmā. (369cd-370ab)
 Even though it is impossible to say that this God has a certain extent, because he, being the great Lord whose form is consciousness [itself], is not perceivable, - as I have clearly stated in my *Prabodhapañcādāśikā*: "It is said (*kīlā*) that the characteristic of matter lies in the fact that its light is limited. Knowledge is different from matter - for it cannot be delimited" - nevertheless this God, who is free from the means of "measurement" [i.e. knowledge], makes himself into [the world of] moving and immovable [beings] through his own autonomy. (370cd-373)

The manifold existence of the ten Śiva divisions [of the Śaiva Śāstra] comes into existence from Tāma, Tatpuruṣa and Sadyojāta (*ajāta*) by taking them singly, [either] emerged or about to emerge,⁶⁴ as six, as one group of three, and as three pairs. (374-375ab)

It is therefore through the blending of various states of consciousness⁶⁵ [peculiar to specific faces] that cognitions of duality are created in this (*atra*) [division] called Śiva. (375cd-376ab)

When these three faces are combined with the left [Vāmadeva] and the right one [Aghora], then each of them has the potentiality to appear in future, to appear in present or to have appeared (?), and there are therefore three [states] in each of these six. The division of Rudra is therefore eighteen-fold. (376cd-377)

Since it is taught that each face itself consists of five faces, the tenfold and eighteen-fold division⁶⁶ are therefore innumerable through [further] divisions. (378)

As these [faces] have been described above as diverse through their own respective cognitions and actions, there is therefore no repetition in them. (379)

For in each of them (*tatra tatra*) a different (*anvānya*) knowledge [i.e. doctrine], prescribed religious conduct and ritual procedure is taught, but each of them leads to the light of Śiva. (380)

Just as every single drop of water [loses its individuality] in the ocean, likewise all cognitions and activities come to rest in Śiva, who is the ocean of consciousness. (381)

64. Lit., "wishing to emerge."

65. Lit., "From the various states of consciousness through blending..."

66. Lit., "that which is divided into ten and eighteen."

391 tam ruderisvabhairavākhyam sūtram triḥā |
 392 ito hi triḥarveṣam jñānasattā vijnimbhate ||391||
 393 edicta bhedabhedena pūṇenabhedasandhinā |
 394 hi ca mukhyāḥ sambhāvyas tīṣṭa icchādīśaktayaḥ ||392||
 395 ātrava tu prapancena pañcasaktyādyvijñanam |
 396 tthānānādhye vibhūṇam tat trikam eva param tathā ||393||
 397 trāṇi āśmadgūṇaḥ saṃpradayaśramāḥ sūṇām |
 398 tveva hi māṇasyad vamaśakṣīnāśrayaḥ ||394||
 399 chāra pramāṇapramāṇe kaulikī pravijnimbhate |
 400 tvaṇīpi sa mūṭhasaśbhāṣopadhisunīḥharāḥ ||395||
 401 navaḥ paramāṇubhāṣyādravābrmīḥavṛttikāḥ |
 402 satvāśakṣīnāśrayaḥ saktirayam kramāt |
 403 paramāṇapramāṇaṁ krodhītyavasthate ||396||
 404 avibhāṣyāt bhedavibhagam
 405 āśrayavakid aṭṭa tam anantam
 406 anīśvāśrayaḥ paramaśrayarūpam
 407 āśrayaḥ paramāṇubhāṣyādravābrmīḥavṛttikāḥ |
 408 āśrayaḥ paramāṇubhāṣyādravābrmīḥavṛttikāḥ ||397||
 409 āśrayaḥ paramāṇubhāṣyādravābrmīḥavṛttikāḥ |
 410 āśrayaḥ paramāṇubhāṣyādravābrmīḥavṛttikāḥ ||398||
 411 āśrayaḥ paramāṇubhāṣyādravābrmīḥavṛttikāḥ |
 412 āśrayaḥ paramāṇubhāṣyādravābrmīḥavṛttikāḥ ||399||

Thus a threefold Tantra exists which is called Rudra, Śiva and Bhairava. For in fact the reality of knowledge unfolds threefold, through duality, duality-cum-nonduality and full union with non-duality. And thus the main powers of Śiva are three, [namely] volition, cognition and action. (391–392)

But among [these powers] a conjunction with five powers etc. [takes place] by extension (*prapāṇena*). Being internally variegated (*vibhinna*) in this way this trinity (*trikam*) [of powers] is the supreme [, and] such a Śāstra resides in the house of my Guru in an unbroken tradition. (393–394ab)

Therefore, because of its proximity to the Śāstras of the Vāma and Dakṣiṇa, the stream on the highest limit (*prāṇadhārā*) unfolds as the Kaula. (394cd–395ah)

Thereafter, as Bhairava is completely filled with the limitations of the objects, he has resorbed and is diminished by the sound that emerges from the highest reality, he embraces the three powers Aparā, Parāparā and Parā in the [three streams] Kāna, Vāmadeva and Aghora respectively. (395cd–396)

So he unfolds the division of duality,

he is the one who makes it manifest,

then wishes to devour this endless manifested form of Śiva.

In reality he is taught to be only three-headed. (397)

The Tantras of the upper [i.e. the Siddhānta-Tantras], of the left (*vāma*) and the right [stream], as well as the Kulas are centred in this [highest] stream so that they loose the contraction through duality. (398)

Having become threefold, this doctrine of the Trika (*trikārtha*), which deals with the highest light, is taught by Śiva [in MVT 1.1] with the word “moon of knowledge”. (399)

391a in TAV 1.18 (p. 45) and TAV 1.230. 391a in TAV 1.18 (p. 45) and TAV 1.230.
 392b in TAV 1.18 (p. 45). 392b in TAV 1.18 (p. 45).
 393a in TAV 1.18 (p. 45). 393a in TAV 1.18 (p. 45).
 394a in TAV 1.18 (p. 45). 394a in TAV 1.18 (p. 45).
 395a in TAV 1.18 (p. 45). 395a in TAV 1.18 (p. 45).
 396a in TAV 1.18 (p. 45). 396a in TAV 1.18 (p. 45).
 397a in TAV 1.18 (p. 45). 397a in TAV 1.18 (p. 45).
 398a in TAV 1.18 (p. 45). 398a in TAV 1.18 (p. 45).
 399a in TAV 1.18 (p. 45). 399a in TAV 1.18 (p. 45).

Part 3
Commentary

Section 1
Introductory Verses 1–13

verse 1
Prefixed to the introductory part of the work is a verse that appears in the same position in other works of Abhinavagupta, like *Tantrāloka*, *Tantrasāra* and *Pañcārṇavikāvirāṇa*.¹ In the *Tantrāloka* Jayaratha provides us with an elaborate explanation of this verse. In the first level of interpretation he gives a Kula/Krama interpretation: the “five faces” are, for instance, interpreted as the standard set of powers, namely ‘consciousness, bliss, volition, cognition and action’² as well as the five streams (*pañcavāha*) of the Krama.³ The main point of the verse is its second level of meaning, which contains an allusion to Abhinavagupta’s parents Vimalā and Narasimhagupta (*pañcanukha* = *sinha*) and to his being born from a union of the two.⁴

The next seven verses are devoted to the author’s *gurus*, that is his teachers in philosophy and religion, and his father. Verses 9 and 10 would probably be termed ‘proclamation of one’s own capability and authority for writing the work’ by a traditional commentator.⁵ Then the repeated request of two pupils is given as the immediate cause for writing the work and the form of the work is justified.

At the end of the introduction we find another benedictory stanza that foreshadows the main idea of the first verse of the Tantra to be expounded and here

¹ The concluding verse 4 of the *Gitāthasamgraha* which is identical with concluding verse 5 of the *Parīṣitsikāśaṭvartī* (*abhinavagupta śūktā tadvṛtta yā mahatvāro deṇāh tad-abhinavaguptaṁ abhinavaguptaṁ śūktā tadvṛtta*), might be considered as an earlier version.

² *pañcavāha* *pañcavāha* *pañcavāha* *pañcavāha* *pañcavāha*, TĀV 1.1 (p. 71).

³ *pañcavāha* *pañcavāha* *pañcavāha* *pañcavāha* *pañcavāha*, TĀV 1.1 (p. 111). See below, 46–47.

⁴ I may be brief here, as an extensive commentary on this verse will appear in SANDERSON (1996). For the *nirvāṇa* of Bhairava to which the *bhairava* alludes, see SANDERSON (1995), p. 62–63.

⁵ *śāntarūpa* and *śāntarūpa*. See Jayaratha’s introduction to TĀ 1.15–16, where verse 15 is ‘commitment’ to write a certain work (*prajñā*) and 16 the announcement by the author of his ability to do so.

it would make perfect sense to translate *arthaughāḥ* as "less clear. Although" (es), the use of the words "current" and "stream" points to a comparison of the entirety of knowledge with an ocean,¹⁷ and the ability of these currents to lead to liberation is compared to the cooling effect the water has on the "heat" of *saṃsāra*. The doctrines are "radiating in" these streams, evoking the poetical convention of jewels in oceans or rivers, which produce their glittering, similar image is used in the *JPV*.¹⁸

[illegible]

Sumati, Śambhunātha's teacher, is the first guru of the Trika known to later authors and this *paramparā* is referred to as 'disciples of Sumati' (TĀ 1.213).²¹

Commenting on a similar introductory verse in the TĀ, Jayaratha gives a more formal explanation for the fact that Abhinavagupta not only included his father in the list of gurus, but placed him in the highest position: 'It is said [*Manuṣṣṛti* 2.145ab] that "a master (*ācārya*) is ten times more [venerable] than a teacher, the father a hundred times more than the teacher [...] ..."²¹

[illegible]

III Commentary

— 218 — “Only the extraordinary sage Abhinavagupta
“acquires”.”⁵¹ Jyotirmū tries to fill the name with the ad-

He — everywhere (*adhi*) — that is in the multitude of conveniences, an
[object] that are completely divided into unmeasurable li-
mitless like object object etc. preserved (*gupta*) i.e. with his pervade-
[adhi] maintain nature guarded although obscured through the de-
[adhi] through the *pratyak* (inner) of the self that is an awareness of
the spiritual that are unbroken ability to know and act, and therefore is
[adhi] an extraordinary being, [i.e.] the author [*adhi* *pratyak*] is fit to
perform this service. This is the meaning.”⁵²

Section 2 The Mūlasūtra

verse 14

This is a lot of material of the introductory verse to the MVT. Śaṅkaraśāstra com-
mentary (1.1.14) — Rāmakaṇṭha II are anxious to identify the first verse in
statement *mūlasūtra* i.e. *śūtra*, for it contains the entire work in essence.⁵³
It is situated only at the end of the introductory dialogue. To my knowledge
Abhinavagupta does not apply this terminology in the *Māhāt*, although it is part
of the exceptional position of his school.⁵⁴ But his commentary shows that the
introductory invocation (*śūtrasūtra*) is, or is equivalent to, a *mūlasūtra*.

As some is the first part of the text that is translated here explains the sec-
ond line of the verse, namely the philosophical implications of the image of the
rays of the moon on Śiva's head that are reflected in and exuded from his face.
The position for Abhinavagupta's laborious attempt to work out the philoso-
phical details lies in the identification of the union with knowledge.⁵⁵ In its descent
the light of knowledge articulates itself in successively grosser stages and thus
becomes the *Agni* i.e. *Saṅga* scripture. Connected to this spiral descent is a
descent into creation: the knowledge embodied in this revelation becomes di-
versified as the world is being differentiated from consciousness on the lower
levels of the universe. The crucial stage of differentiation is however that into
five powers represented as Śiva's five faces.

With this interpretation our author tries to demonstrate not only the philo-
sophical side of the *śūtra* that the *Agni* are valid, because they are taught
by Śiva, but also how the diversity of *Agni* with sometimes incompatible fac-
tories can be attributed to a single deity. But this is not a service done by a non-
sectarian to the *Saṅga* community; for Abhinavagupta only the *Trika* — which

⁵¹ See Rāmakaṇṭha's commentary on *Kṛtānanta* 1.12 (1100A1) (1995), p. 11 of the
edition.

⁵² Cf. TAV 18, the *śūtra* in the *śūtra* of *śūtra*.

⁵³ The crucial compound *śūtrasūtra* is quoted in 199 to mark the end of the first chapter of
the *Śūtra*.

— 218 — “Only the extraordinary sage Abhinavagupta
“acquires”.”⁵¹ Jyotirmū tries to fill the name with the ad-
He — everywhere (*adhi*) — that is in the multitude of conveniences, an
[object] that are completely divided into unmeasurable li-
mitless like object object etc. preserved (*gupta*) i.e. with his pervade-
[adhi] maintain nature guarded although obscured through the de-
[adhi] through the *pratyak* (inner) of the self that is an awareness of
the spiritual that are unbroken ability to know and act, and therefore is
[adhi] an extraordinary being, [i.e.] the author [*adhi* *pratyak*] is fit to
perform this service. This is the meaning.”⁵²

verse 15-17...
 Vaidhyanathan 110-141 adopted as the *lectio difficilior*.

Here the main part of the commentary starts by examining the meaning of the "knowledge" mentioned in MVT 1.1 and by introducing some of the key ideas that are discussed later in the work: the identity of the "limitless reality", i.e. the highest form of Śiva, with the world (*Isa*); the appearance of diversity without division from the source in the simile of the light and its rays, and the description of consciousness itself (*hṛdayam* = *cid*!) as an active and creative awareness.²

An exegetical etymology for *hṛdaya*, which shows that the heart of Śiva stands for consciousness itself, is given by Abhinava in the *Parāṭīrṇṣikā-maṇḍana* (p. 61):

1 *hr̥amam bodhiparivāṣaḥ*, see *Mrgendruvāntra*, Vidyāpāda 131c
 2 For further information on this philosophical position, see TORELLI s (1994a), p. 111–12.
 3 The series normally includes the *śaṅsūpramāṇā*
 4 *śaṅsūpa nāṣṭhādāḥ deḥaparaṇābuddhādeḥ ca param pratyakṣāśāstram saṁskṛtā-
 hr̥i tvaṁsa nāṣṭhādāḥ prakalpitābhedaḥ ca śūntrīṇa cāśūntrīyānāṁ* The word *śaṅsū-*

... with *ki'im*, and the second *tā'wat* at the end could have
... *ssim* with reference to the state intermediate [between
... and duality].¹⁵

observed that Abhinavagupta's method of quotation is problematic. ... to establish the exact wording of the quoted text.¹⁶ Similar problems occur when he names the source as *the guru*. I propose distinguishing the instances in the *Vizṇṇika* into three types:

- [illegible]

[illegible]

1. ... refers to Sambhūtanātha, as in 364n, but equally to the whole paṇḍitī of
 2. The "disciples" of Śūnārī (see above).
 3. ... is read that this passage is an allusion to the *Saṁvādabodhiyānī* (or Vānāśa-
 4. ... is identified with Śaṅkara, the possibility that the author of the *Saṁvādabodhiyānī*
 5. ... is identical with Abhinavagupta's teacher Vānāśaka (see TĀ 37.62). This
 6. ... is clear there is no consensus as to whether the author of the *Saṁvādabodhiyānī* has with
 7. ... the author of the *Samprasaṅga* are identical. TONELLI (2002: 105) and
 8. ... abhisekita to view. (TĀ 13.41.1.0904a), p. 482, fr. 41. DEZCOWSKI (1992: 105)
 9. ... (DEZCOWSKI 1992, p. 305). A review of the question as to whether the author of the *Samprasaṅga*
 10. ... (DEZCOWSKI 1992), but it is not at all clear if this is the author of the *Saṁvādabodhiyānī*.
 11. ... Abhinavagupta's teacher. Śūnārī is identified with Vānāśaka (see TĀ 37.62).
 12. ... to a Pañcika school. Śūnārī is identified with Vānāśaka (see TĀ 37.62).
 13. ... is not an act; a legend. The dualist might suggest that Śūnārī is a direct, and the
 14. ... of Abhinavagupta when he would not identify the *Saṁvādabodhiyānī* with a direct
 15. ... Śaṅkara, Rāmānandī's father, quotes the *Saṁvādabodhiyānī* (see TĀ 37.62).

The references under 1. are unproblematic, those under 2. can, at least in the works on *Trika*, be interpreted as referring to his teacher in the *Trika*, Śaṅkhaśūdra. None of the instances under 3. can be interpreted with any certainty, they might refer to a specific person in the honorific plural, to Śaṅkhaśūdra or to gurus in general.

4.1 Śāstra as the Knowledge Inherent in Consciousness

if the *pāruṣpikā* had remained silent here, the structure of the whole work would have emerged more clearly. But the question initiates a protracted discussion of the "basics" of *Pratyabhijñā* and their bearing on the concept of revealed scripture.

The *pārijayika* raises one of the main problems in the author's argumentation. It may seem strange that the opponent argues against a thesis that has not yet been made, but I suppose that the proposition that is perceived to be problematic can be inferred from [7a, where it was stated that the primordial reality is essentially "incultured" (*abhinirāta*), and that one would have to understand this as an interpretation of MVT 1.1. The question therefore really means: if the rays emitting from Śiva's mouth are the source of the Śāstra and the further development of the world¹⁹ and reflect his consciousness without distortion, and if, moreover, Śiva is conceived of as a non-dual reality, then the existence of a Śāstra, or even a plurality of Śāstras with potentially conflicting theses and injunctions, cannot be explained, as they would depend on differential thought, which is excluded in a non-dual reality. The question is not really settled until [7b and the answer deals with various issues involved: the relationship between light and knowledge, light as a direct expression of the knowledge inherent in it, inclusive non-duality, differentiation without real division, absence of time, etc.

There are several ways to understand the compound *śāstrādisaṃpadah* and the related phrases in 39 and 49. Theoretically *saṃpad* and, especially, *ribhiti* (49) could be taken to mean *siddhi*, but this is debarrd by the context. Taking *saṃpad* merely as a plural marker is possible,²⁰ yet the interpretation as an

¹⁹⁾ As the Śāstra is created before duality becomes manifest, it is created before the world; *nādi* could therefore mean "the world of duality."

20 Like *amṛta* in *śivacandrikā* *śivacandrikā* in 13d.

and eight "mothers".⁴⁶

...not ignore the problematic passage in the PTV, where
...states that the "goddesses of the senses" (*karapadevanā*), which
...are described in the scriptures
...the realm of Lord Bhairava."⁴⁸

By preceding this section is a description of another pantheon
 ties derived from the Krama: *khecarī*, *gacārī*, *dikēarī*, and
 emanations of *rāmeśvarī*.⁴⁹ Abhinava's treatment is
 clous, because he has to adapt the terminology to the verse
 is commenting upon. In his commentary *khecarī* is the
 all others, i.e. *vyācentī*, *gacārī*, *dikēarī*, and *bhīcarī*, are
 Prīnted that we accept the *Parayantapāñcāśikā* as a work of
 the following verse from this work would prove that the
 ary sequence: "Plunging into the great lake, into the
 of the sell that is *rāmeśvarī*, who is full of the four *valas*, i.e.
 ury etc., one should submerge the insentient work."⁵²

What is striking in this section of the PTV is that there seems to be a confusion of pantheons, some of the statements and quotations point to the eight mothers,⁵³ others to the Krma deities already mentioned. I suppose the ambiguity is deliberately not resolved to suggest that, although the Krma deities are mentioned, our author did not want to follow the Śākta path of a purely female pantheon, but integrated it into the Kaula or Māhāyāna path, as he does so by showing structural similarities rather than

1. 2. 985, 496, 760 (Sarasijññanāra); RE 108716 (Sarasijññanāra, Hāsa-
ra, 108716, 108717, 108718, 108719, 108720, 108721, 108722, 108723, 108724, 108725, 108726, 108727, 108728, 108729, 108730, 108731, 108732, 108733, 108734, 108735, 108736, 108737, 108738, 108739, 108740, 108741, 108742, 108743, 108744, 108745, 108746, 108747, 108748, 108749, 108750, 108751, 108752, 108753, 108754, 108755, 108756, 108757, 108758, 108759, 108760, 108761, 108762, 108763, 108764, 108765, 108766, 108767, 108768, 108769, 108770, 108771, 108772, 108773, 108774, 108775, 108776, 108777, 108778, 108779, 108780, 108781, 108782, 108783, 108784, 108785, 108786, 108787, 108788, 108789, 108790, 108791, 108792, 108793, 108794, 108795, 108796, 108797, 108798, 108799, 108800, 108801, 108802, 108803, 108804, 108805, 108806, 108807, 108808, 108809, 108810, 108811, 108812, 108813, 108814, 108815, 108816, 108817, 108818, 108819, 108820, 108821, 108822, 108823, 108824, 108825, 108826, 108827, 108828, 108829, 108830, 108831, 108832, 108833, 108834, 108835, 108836, 108837, 108838, 108839, 108840, 108841, 108842, 108843, 108844, 108845, 108846, 108847, 108848, 108849, 108850, 108851, 108852, 108853, 108854, 108855, 108856, 108857, 108858, 108859, 108860, 108861, 108862, 108863, 108864, 108865, 108866, 108867, 108868, 108869, 108870, 108871, 108872, 108873, 108874, 108875, 108876, 108877, 108878, 108879, 108880, 108881, 108882, 108883, 108884, 108885, 108886, 108887, 108888, 108889, 108890, 108891, 108892, 108893, 108894, 108895, 108896, 108897, 108898, 108899, 108900, 108901, 108902, 108903, 108904, 108905, 108906, 108907, 108908, 108909, 108910, 108911, 108912, 108913, 108914, 108915, 108916, 108917, 108918, 108919, 108920, 108921, 108922, 108923, 108924, 108925, 108926, 108927, 108928, 108929, 108930, 108931, 108932, 108933, 108934, 108935, 108936, 108937, 108938, 108939, 108940, 108941, 108942, 108943, 108944, 108945, 108946, 108947, 108948, 108949, 108950, 108951, 108952, 108953, 108954, 108955, 108956, 108957, 108958, 108959, 108960, 108961, 108962, 108963, 108964, 108965, 108966, 108967, 108968, 108969, 108970, 108971, 108972, 108973, 108974, 108975, 108976, 108977, 108978, 108979, 108980, 108981, 108982, 108983, 108984, 108985, 108986, 108987, 108988, 108989, 108990, 108991, 108992, 108993, 108994, 108995, 108996, 108997, 108998, 108999, 109000, 109001, 109002, 109003, 109004, 109005, 109006, 109007, 109008, 109009, 109010, 109011, 109012, 109013, 109014, 109015, 109016, 109017, 109018, 109019, 109020, 109021, 109022, 109023, 109024, 109025, 109026, 109027, 109028, 109029, 109030, 109031, 109032, 109033, 109034, 109035, 109036, 109037, 109038, 109039, 109040, 109041, 109042, 109043, 109044, 109045, 109046, 109047, 109048, 109049, 109050, 109051, 109052, 109053, 109054, 109055, 109056, 109057, 109058, 109059, 109060, 109061, 109062, 109063, 109064, 109065, 109066, 109067, 109068, 109069, 109070, 109071, 109072, 109073, 109074, 109075, 109076, 109077, 109078, 109079, 109080, 109081, 109082, 109083, 109084, 109085, 109086, 109087, 109088, 109089, 109090, 109091, 109092, 109093, 109094, 109095, 109096, 109097, 109098, 109099, 109100, 109101, 109102, 109103, 109104, 109105, 109106, 109107, 109108, 109109, 109110, 109111, 109112, 109113, 109114, 109115, 109116, 109117, 109118, 109119, 109120, 109121, 109122, 109123, 109124, 109125, 109126, 109127, 109128, 109129, 109130, 109131, 109132, 109133, 109134, 109135, 109136, 109137, 109138, 109139, 109140, 109141, 109142, 109143, 109144, 109145, 109146, 109147, 109148, 109149, 109150, 109151, 109152, 109153, 109154, 109155, 109156, 109157, 109158, 109159, 109160, 109161, 109162, 109163, 109164, 109165, 109166, 109167, 109168, 109169, 109170, 109171, 109172, 109173, 109174, 109175, 109176, 109177, 109178, 109179, 109180, 109181, 109182, 109183, 109184, 109185, 109186, 109187, 109188, 109189, 109190, 109191, 109192, 109193, 109194, 109195, 109196, 109197, 109198, 109199, 109200, 109201, 109202, 109203, 109204, 109205, 109206, 109207, 109208, 109209, 109210, 109211, 109212, 109213, 109214, 109215, 109216, 109217, 109218, 109219, 10922

47882, 47818/47828, *Suzrajanamini* (cf. Tā 8.24rd-74. 51) *ari*, *Kannari*, *Vasuvāri*, *Vārāhi*, *Indrāṇī* and *Cānuṇḍā*. Cf. Tā 8.24rd-74. 51 *Araka*.

For details and references, see GOSWAMI (1985), p. 287-289.

...demonstrates the reversal is not too problematic.

work bears no formal impact on the strength of the

... and his name and the like. This is the first of the three...
... who even dated Sumas, some suspicion is appropriate...
... *chappuram mahathiratham* | some can in the third line right a book...
... the *Mad*...

... mentioning Siva's personality and the quotation from the ...

by trying in unequal numbers; the set of Krama deities are described on a psychological level as personifications of deluding states of mind like "lust", "anger" etc.⁵⁴ This "inequality" of the states of mind is *samsāra* and therefore nothing but an ignorance of reality. The Kaula set of deities can be described in very similar terms: their activity binds the soul even closer to *samsāra* as long as their true nature remains unrecognized; if recognized, they grant liberation in life.⁵⁵

The same passage from the *Śaṅkṛāṇṭarā* is quoted in *Ā 27.6* in a different context,⁵⁶ but pointing to a similar interpretation. There the use of mantras from the 'higher' scriptures in the installation of catur idols is forbidden, because these mantras can only grant perfection (*siddhi*), if they are used secretly and internally; outside they might be even dangerous. This is explained by Śivā's lack for enjoyment and by alluding to the negative consequences for the worshipper, who fails to comply with it;⁵⁷ the same quotation from the *Śaṅkṛāṇṭarā* is then adduced as a scriptural support. Here the desire for enjoyment, which is more readily connected with ferocious deities,⁵⁸ is projected onto Śiva. In the *Vārnikā* the quotation has been adduced for similar reasons; the concept of enjoyment as a source of liberation, which was mentioned in 45, is explained in an admittedly oblique way through the quotation: if the desire of the deities is gratified through enjoyment, they grant perfection, or liberation.⁵⁹

54. *suva khetari kinnakumbhākiriputavā vāisamveta lakṣyate* | PTV, p. 40.

55 *apṛatyajñīnīnīrūpāḥ ... śūmāśīrīkṛpāśūpārūhādhādhānīyāh | ... jñānīnīrūpāḥ* in evok-
 byakṛta jñānīnīrūpāḥ *pratyajñīnīnīrūpāḥ* | PTV, p. 43f. This might have been the inspiration for
Pratyajñīnīnīrūpāḥ, Sūtra 12 and 13, which also connects both pantheons. The proximity
 of both sets of deities is also indicated in the anonymous quotation in TAY on 29.16.

[illegible]

⁵⁸ They are described as "desiring to devour" (Lit.: "lick") (*lehihūm* glossed as *bhokum* *raḡm* by Śivopadhyaṇa; see below), for instance in *Mahātmyasopraśasti* (TSS) 7.142; *mu-*

occurs in *Vijñānābhairavatantra* 77b, interestingly in a metrically wrong passage (bha-

Harunaga Isaacson informs me that *nerihūm*, which is known to the dictionaries only from lexicography, actually occurs in the *Ur-Skinchupuzium* (I.4.19c) being edited at present by

⁵⁰ We can distinguish many aspects of this structure, a ritual one ("outside" deities are gratified by forbidden substances, a domestic one (signature is recognized), and one of internal

...ritual (inner experiences are the offering) which forms the bridge between the other two.

the construction *vybhajane ...upāsārite* as a dual. The other possibility would be the creative of a *śaṁhāhāra-dvāndvya*.

The two verses sum up the creation of the Śāstra in order to answer the question of the *śaṁhāhāra-dvāndvya*. As the differentiation inside consciousness becomes more and more complex, the expression of knowledge is objectified as the Śāstra and de-voiceless. At the lowest level of human speech, thus knowledge is reduced to a differentiated doctrine that eventually crystalizes in a text. The formulation of this process sounds rather complicated and the reason for this is probably the author's inconsistency, in order to maintain his monistic standpoint. The author wants to disguise the more straightforward doctrine that the knowledge of the source in the lotus of Śiva's face, though one, becomes manifold, and it is used to objects.⁸⁰ This model works in the Siddhānta, where the world is created by the cosmic process, but it has to be reinterpreted, if the Śāstra and the world are created by the same process, if, in other words, Śiva is the direct source of the world.

Section 5 The Five Powers

Up to this point the author, by mentioning only three powers, had suggested that he was dealing with levels within the Trika. Applied to the hierarchy of the Śāstra the introduction of the five powers of Śiva marks the transition to the theological realm dominated by the Siddhānta. As explained in the introduction, the pentad of faces or mantras is a pan-Śaiva doctrine used in the Siddhānta for the legitimation of its own hierarchy of the Āgamic canon.⁸¹ The Trika-Śaivas could not alter this structure without coming into contradiction with scripture itself, but the aim was never to render the Siddhānta completely invalid: to remain in control of the whole Śaiva revelation it was crucial to include it as a lower level. The most natural solution was therefore to find a scriptural passage that would back up the claim for an extension of the fivefold structure (160) and to demonstrate that the pentad is only a further differentiation of the Trika (393).

verses 50–51

It is interesting to note that the pentad of powers is deduced from this less than obvious passage in the MVT, because our author, despite all claims that "everything is in the *Mālinī*", does not slavishly adhere to this Tantra for quotations, and the same doctrine could probably have been obtained more easily from elsewhere. If this is not just accidental we ought to conclude that Abhinavagupta wanted to demonstrate that the scope of the *Mālinī* was not limited to the higher levels only, but was capable of including also the pentadic structure of the Siddhānta's Śādaśivamūrti.

The pun with *prapañca/pañca* is probably the reason for the inverted position of some of the words in this quotation. The text of the original runs as follows:⁸²

⁸⁰ That this pentadic structure is Siddhānta-orientated is proven by the fact that the upper face (Śaiva) is reserved for the Siddhānta Āgamas. See Introduction for details.

⁸¹ This is quoted from Somdev VASUDEVA's forthcoming edition of the text. GNOLI reads *parvata/par-paṭvata* in his translation of the MVT and the TĀ (GNOLI 1972, p. 335 and p. 391). The reading is, but this must be just a misprint. The transmission of the text is

si nī dhīnaṁpreṇkāṭvatiḥ || 2.34||
 = śhataśat abhūmanti api pañcādha ||
 eḍi vāḥśvān vatu kīrtitum || 2.35||

quoted in the *ṭīkā* 10.185 for a different pentadic structure:

ment, 13) "If each one of the lower forms merges into the preceding, would give up its own nature. As a consequence there would not be any e for the fifteenfold nature of the perceiving subjects up to *maṭra* (*maṭra* *śāśh*). To this objection he replies:

T.V) This has been prescribed by the Creator in the *Śrīpāra*[śāstra, i.e. M.V.T.,¹ for he proclaims that the nature of the states of waking etc. correspond to his being equipped with activity (*vyāpāra*-), with sovereignty (*svādīpāra* etc. Although Śiva is undivided, [this division] is due to his subtle inner knowledge.⁴

In his commentary, Jayaratha quotes the full verse from the MVT and indicates a correlation between the five states of consciousness and the five principal powers.⁵

M.V.T.	śaktiḥ	avisthā
svāyāpara-	kriyā	jāgarā
adhipatyena	jñānam	svapnāḥ
taddhīnapratyakāṭaḥ	icchā	saṁsṛptam
icchānivyrtteḥ	ānandah	turyam
svāśhātād	cit	turyāṭitam

As we shall see later, other pentads could be added to this structure.

5.1 The Nature of Time

The question in 5.2 provokes a long digression on the relation of manifestation, cognition and time. The author tries to come back to the main topic in 125 but succeeds not before 133.

One of the important points of Abhinavagupta's doctrine is what we could call a gradual transition from nonduality to duality. To indicate the intermediate (*bhṛtābhedha*) state, the term "differentiation" has been used instead of "division". Simplifying the matter slightly one might say that "differentiation", which does not entail duality, is a process inside consciousness, whereas duality entails a projection of the already differentiated content to the outside.

At this point in the discussion we are still in the intermediate state⁶ and the pentadic structure is therefore without the corollaries of duality like time and space. This is, however, difficult to believe for the opponent, who counters by eliciting a clear statement from our author. Abhinavagupta can only agree and is then confronted with the fact that he has already used divisions of time.

verse 53

For the identification of the deity Kālī with time, see TĀ 6.7:

[Commentary] If the whole universe appears only as merged in consciousness, as its appearance cannot otherwise come about, there is – because of its eternity – no connection of consciousness with time. How can on the other hand [be explained that time is connected] to a group of things which is inseparable from it [consciousness]. To this he responds:
 [TĀ] In its highest form⁷ time, being of the nature of sequence and non-sequence, resides in consciousness. It is called *kālī* and is the highest power of God.⁸

⁶ Verse 49 is an exception, a leap forward to duality in order to answer the introductory question.

⁷ GOSW proposes to read *śarvāt* with one manuscript for *parāt*, but I tend to think that Abhinavagupta, while identifying Kālī with the highest power wants to make the point that this form of time is not equivalent to the *tattva* of the same name, and have therefore retained *parāt*.

⁸ *namo sarvām idam jagat saṁvittirgṇānam evāṁvibhūtiḥ śivāthā hy aṣṭa bhūtaṁ eva śaḥ bhūteḥ, śaṁvūḥ ca mṛtyorpi kālasya gṇānāni, itī katham aṣṭa bhūtaṁ jagatva bhūtaśaṁvūḥ saṁvūḥ itī ātṛktyāha "kṛantīkṛmāṇāni kālāi ca parāḥ saṁvūḥ śivāte ||". [Kālī nāma parā śaktiḥ śiva bhūteṣu gīvate ||?]"*

tra idānīm styādhbhedakalanā na kāci PTV, p. 5
the construction of division as [evident in] 'but',
etc.

To avoid this problematic point, the *pārāpakṣa* has
the differentiation inherent in this account of the
had pre-posed the concept of time from the very be-
ginning of the commentary itself (15c) he has used *prāk* to
refer to 19c he refers to a future division, etc.

1. *Rajataranginī* 3.135 and means "Gleichstellung" ac-

ceptual explanation. Following the more usual sense
and have to translate: a "blue lotus".⁵ RānākaraGm.
the word *nīlapankaja* in *Hevajatantra* 1.3.7, says ever-
um *utpalam*.¹⁰ In fact blue lotusess are known only to
be a fictitious poetic convention would not serve the
text. It might be argued that to the mediaeval Indian mind
were not unreal,¹² but in our case the solution is, I think,
the definition in the *Amarakoṣa*, perhaps not used too
often, which gives *nīlāmbujanna* as a name of the blue
lotus. In other words *ambujanma*, and probably also other
synonyms (*ambharja*, *saroja* etc.), can exceptionally be used

for "blue lotus" if the colour is stated to be blue.¹⁴ The logic behind this
could indeed be the fact that no blue lotus exists in nature and that therefore
no ambiguity exists.

5.2 Light as Knowledge

This passage is preliminary to the discussion of time that follows in the next
section.

verse 58-59

The translation of *prajñā* in 58d is confirmed by the similar phrase *prajñā-
nagatā* in JPT 1.5.2.4.1.1, p. 1551.

In other words, cognition different from the light of consciousness would
be required to know the light; then this knowledge would imply a light differ-
ent from this light has to become manifest, and so on. It follows that one has to
assume identity of light and cognition in order to prevent the logical fault of
infinite regress.

verse 60

The similar *apramāṇam* occurs in TĀ 1.26, where ignorance is defined
not as the absence of knowledge, but as incomplete knowledge: "Therefore a
knowledge that does not consist of the complete manifestation of a reality to
be known, is ignorance" (J).¹⁶ In combination with *-āma*, the *la*-suffix in
āma does not modify the meaning (*svārthe*) and I assume the same for the one
in *apramāṇam*.

The verse under discussion contains a succinct allusion to the discussion of
perceptibility in the *Trika*, which is a response to the Mīmāṃsāka doctrine of
"manifestedness" (*pratyakṣa*) understood as a quality of objects.¹⁷ An exten-
sive treatment of this controversy is given in the chapter on *vaśīkārma* in

⁵ S. Elammi, "rare blue lotus" to avoid contradiction, but her source for the identification
is as far as I can see, the *Suśāntapadma*, which mentions *nīlāmbujanna* as a synonym
for *nīlapankaja*. Since we have seen, this does not mean that *indira* can come to mean "blue lotus",
but that *indira* and *ambujanna* can irregularly be used for "blue water-lily". See S. Elammi, p. 102.

¹⁶ The observation can perhaps reconcile us with Indian poetry, whose lack of natural
language in his famous article on lotusess.

¹⁷ Jayaratha identifies the opponent's side as *kaumārīka* *maṇḍa* (TĀV 10.21) and
also (TĀV 10.57). According to him, there is a difference between the two sides which

15. Ibid. on 4.1.3, where Uppulakṣya had stated that the object, in order to be able to manifest itself, must consist of light. But it is not possible to account for sensory perception only by supposing a "light in the object", because, if this were the case, then all objects would be manifest to all the time. Abhinavagupta brings out this criticism levelled in the *Upaniṣad* and the *Atmanirṇaya* by Uppul¹⁸ and says:

The *sva* suffix is to be found in the [Mīmāṃsaka] doctrine of 'manifested-ness' [as in their doctrine] the light is completely merged with the body of the object; then the existence of light as connected to the perceiver, as in the concept of 'the light is manifest to me', is difficult to account for.¹⁰

So I am to say this is not due to the Mimamsaka theory of perception, which, like theosophy and accounts, supposes two 'lights', one inside and one outside – to come to the perceived objects themselves, both of which meet in the process of perception.⁵⁰

At the same time, the Kammaradas hold that 'untruthfulness' resides in the object, and that the subject is free of it. This is the view of the Kammaradas in the *Pratya-*

10. *śūnyatā* (emptiness), p. 113. "In formulating the Suvarṇa position, Utp. is implicitly radical in that it is of the Buddhist and Kantian thrusts... For Kantianity, on the contrary, an added element is the *śūnyatā* (emptiness) that occurs in the object, from whose presence a fuller reality is inferred. In both cases the light is not separate... as Utp. also maintains. In Utp.'s world so to speak, completely resolved within the object...! According to Utp., "In the manner of the thing (whose essence is light) by the light of the subject."

[illegible]

(8) ...to the object). So they lose being external senses, like the sense of touch, etc., since it is as if they lose function by reaching the object. And again, since the sense perceives mountains, etc. which are much larger, we have to acknowledge how it is able to do so right at the end, which is made up as the nature of light. Similarly, even without opening the eyes, Saṃti and other very distant objects are perceived. Knowledge becomes one with the pervasive external light, even at the moment of perception. Now does there result the possibility of seeing the Gaṇḍi from Krodha to the end? This bit is all pervasive, because it becomes one with all that part of the universe held fast by your unseen potentiality." (Rajaa and Sarada's translation)

"The disjunction of *Pratīti* is too long-winded to be reported here,²¹ but the outcome is a deconstruction of the subject and object of knowledge: on the outside there are no real objects, only a manifestation of light which is identical with consciousness, and on the inside "there is no definite subject in the act of knowledge." (63c)

5.3 The Nature of the Light of Consciousness

return of α_2 to 0

This sums up the discussion of time and states why even objects cannot be divided by time. The reason is the identity of everything with light which is described in the next section. As *SA* will show this is a further argument to tackle the question on time (*SA*).

pages 62 and 63

This is part of the solution for the problem of omniscience in the *Pratyabhiññā*: there is no external light that is responsible for manifestation, but only a light of the subject that manifests objects. Further arguments will follow in 70cd-74.

NYTSE 04

See 6:1 for this suspected use of *sarana* for "[doctrinal] refuge".

Cf. IPV 1.5.2, vol. 1, p. 155 (*iti andhatā jagataḥ*), for the metaphor of darkness.

TABLE 6.5. *Continued*

Here another argument is adduced for the identity of objects with light and the logical impossibility of the object being anything else by nature. In other words, the object, its manifestation and its knowledge cannot be distinguished.²² In the *Pravabhidhishya* Kṣemarāja quotes a line from one of his own, otherwise unknown *Śloka*:

¹¹ It deals, for example, with the interpretation of the phrase "object-light" (*utpatti-prakāśa*), namely whether it should be understood as a subjective or objective genitive, with a causative meaning, whether a metaphorical meaning is involved here, under which circumstances metaphors can be used at all, etc.

¹² See THIBAUT (1994a), p. 111, note 5, on the Buddhist doctrine of *nirvāṇa* (*nirvāṇa* seems to be the background for this concept).

...appearance does not appear, only appearance remains. (But even) if it does, or if appearance remains, its (an appearing non-appearance) is of the nature of appearance.²³

सर्वत्र ७४ab

The *puruṣasūtra* maintains that this theory of manifestation as the concrete universal does not exclude the possibility that an object could exist in an unmanifested state prior to its appearance. The light would then only add objectivity to a pre-existing object. In this context the phrase in 67a means: "This is the ontologically valid position"

verses 68cd-70ab

Hence light or manifestation is identified with Śiva in the sense that Śiva is the reality of everything that appears. This is not just the religious background of a philosophical concept; the description of his "inconceivable power" also tries to silence all questions about the mechanics of the process of manifestation: his "movement" is a playful manifestation of diversity. *ghṛīṇī*, literally "staggering", is a technical term derived from the *Mahini* for describing one of the five stages in body-centred meditation. During this meditation one who is about to enter the reality of consciousness perceives a kind of bliss (*ānanda*), due to contact with the plenitude of consciousness. Then there is the phenomenon of internal "sudden ascension" (*udbhava*), "trembling" (*kampa*) and finally "sleep" (*nidrā*), which lasts until one enters consciousness itself. The actual realization of the plenitude of consciousness is marked by "reeling" or "staggering" (*ghṛīṇī*), as one is no more aware of the body as belonging to the I, but of everything as being included in consciousness.²⁴ In the same passage Jayaratha connects the word *ghṛīṇī* to the vibration of consciousness (*spanda*) and in 69d this is probably what is meant by *ghṛīṇī*. But the choice of words could also be seen as an attempt to identify the sober philosophy of manifestation with the sensuality of a Kaula deity. In order to emphasize this aspect we might translate the compound *svāntarīyoddāmaṅghūrīṇī* as "intoxicated (*uddāma*) with his autonomy and [therefore] staggering".

verses 70cd-74

If Śiva manifests as all reality, then it could be argued that his omniscience

²³ *śūbhrāḥ r vādī na bhavāti bhavātir evāśūbhrasvare bhavāti cet khyātiraparivrat bhavāti evaśūbhrasvare*. *Pratyabhijñānāṇḍya*, Sūtra 4, p. 10. The verb *khyā* suggests the identity between 'appearance' and 'knowledge'.

²⁴ See LA 5 (1964 d. 10)ab.

should also be present in manifestation. This is, however, disproved by ordinary experience, where we see a diversity of knowledge. The problem is related to the argument on "manifestedness" and omniscience.²⁵

A variety of these so-called "reflections", or articulations of awareness (*vismāsa*) are then quoted²⁶ with the intention of showing that manifestation and the corresponding knowledge can be differentiated into time, subject and object, or can be completely undifferentiated up to the point, where subject and object are identical and form only one reality. The point of 73c is of course that the light of manifestation is necessary even for the Buddhist in order to speculate on the self's non-existence.

verses 75-76

I suggest splitting the sentence with the caesura and taking *kaś cī* with *eka*. The translation "single thing" for the masculine pronoun may seem odd at first sight, but the *ekah* is used together with *asah*.

It seems that the opponent has not yet accepted the idea that the "light" is able to project contents and that categories like subject, object, time etc. are no more than such contents. The question refers to the "reflections" mentioned in the preceding passage, which seem to entail a division of light into subjective and objective. He probably means to say that if there is a subjective light which is not aware of an objective light (as in "I, Caitra, do not perceive the cloth"), there cannot be just *one* light.

The reader who has reached this point is relieved by a piece of realistic classroom dialogue. It seems that Abhinava never misses an opportunity to lament the stubbornness of his disciple, who is still not willing to relinquish his "materialistic" interpretation of "light" in favour of the all-inclusive, mystical Śiva-light.

verses 77-78

The opponent tries to show that this theory of *one* light is untenable, as the diversity of things could not be accounted for: the difference between objects would become blurred.

The main line of argumentation adopted by the opponent in 78d is a re-assertion of the concretistic interpretation of *prakāśa*: there cannot be just one

²⁵ See commentary on 60.

²⁶ There is no indication in the original of how to split the single statements. My attempt is perhaps not the only way, but lends some logic to the sequence. In 71c one could consider reading *paṇam* (suggested by TORELLA). It in 71d seems to mark the beginning of a new set of 'reflections' modified by time.

⁴⁵ *Abhinavagupta's attitude to ritual is quite similar. See SANDERSON (1990b), 9.3.1-9.3*

⁴⁵ *Abhinavagupta's attitude to ritual is quite similar. See SANDERSON (1990b), 9.3.1-9.3*

which reality that is utterly subjective and – as Jayaratha says – “pure knowledge” (*śuddhamātra*).⁴⁶ It is difficult to say whether Abhinavagupta’s doctrine is represented properly by Jayaratha, but when we take into consideration the description in the TĀ, the thirty-eighth, as an unobjectifiable reality that is also unnamed, this our context better. The variant in J₁ is therefore rejected.

verses 99*cd*–101

This form of time is not identical with the *tatva* of the same name, but is a power that belongs to Śiva himself.⁴⁷ Jayaratha (TĀV 6.7) explains that one talks of a power or potentiality (*śakti*) to indicate that Śiva does not suffer this differentiation himself, he is still beyond sequence and non-sequence; “a fire, though united with the power to burn, does not show any [signs of being itself burnt] like blisters”.

verses 101*cd*–102*ab*

śatru could be interpreted in a variety of ways, but it must refer to the place where according to Abhinavagupta time has no differentiating influence.

5.3 The Transcendence of Purity

verses 102*cd*–103

śatru refers to an intermediate level in the series of *tatvas*, represented by *śatru* and the five *kañcukas*: *kalā*, *vidyā*, *rāga*, *kāla*, *niyāti*. That the Siddhānta opponent has selected *vidyā* is probably not significant. The series of *kañcukas* starts with *kalā* or *kālā* in the theology of the Siddhānta.⁴⁸

This question introduces a line of argumentation which is crucial for Abhinavagupta’s exegesis of the *Mālinītantra*. As indicated in the introduction, the *Mālinī* shares the basic dualism of many other Āgamas, and from this perspective our author’s claim to be based only on this text and simultaneously to uphold a non-dualistic theory is remarkable. It would on the other hand also be un-

⁴⁶ Jayaratha records that some “who have fallen to the state of negligence” quarrel over whether this doctrine exists only in order to avoid the accusation of having two mutually contradicting qualities, namely transcendence (*transcendunt*) and immanence (*svāpmanā*) in the world. He also rejects the allegation of being in contradiction with scripture on the ground that the thirty-seventh is only for instruction.

⁴⁷ Jayaratha (TĀV 6.7) explains that one talks of a power or potentiality (*śakti*) to indicate that Śiva does not suffer this differentiation himself, he is still beyond sequence and non-sequence; “a fire, though united with the power to burn, does not show any [signs of being itself burnt] like blisters”.

fair to say that Abhinava is deliberately misunderstanding or reinterpreting his primary scriptural source in a manner which is completely foreign to it. There is probably no one philosophy that follows naturally from an Āgama. Dualistic exegesis too has difficulties in finding a consistent philosophy expounded in the text. In a sense much Āgamic material appears to be pre-theoretic, or not properly systematized; whether this is due to a complicated history of redaction, or also to the nature of these texts remains to be seen.

From an unbiased perspective the obstacles to Abhinava’s monistic reading are, however, considerable: the hierarchical structure of the universe with its division into a pure and an impure part are too pervasive, and important for the religious practice he wishes to explain, for a simple non-dualism to be convincing.

In our verse the first problem is raised by the opponent in a forward leap: if we accept this theory of *prakāśa* being the common denominator of everything, the final consequence would be that the hierarchy of *tatvas* could not be maintained, because all the *tatvas* would partake of Śiva’s purity. It has to be remembered that in the dualists’ account of creation Śiva is not in contact with the impure part of the universe, but Ananta, a partially liberated soul, is entrusted with the “office” (*adhikara*) of creating the lower universe and other minions administer it.⁴⁹

verse 104

The intensive *narīrtyāmahe* occurs also in TĀ 10.34: *apūrsam atra viditām narīrtyāmahe tute*. According to Jayaratha the line is meant to be polemical.

verse 105

There are two more or less obvious interpretations: *tai* in pāda c could refer to the “highest reality”, Śiva etc., or to *kathā*. I have adopted the second in order to maintain consistency with 124. It then comes to mean that the concept of purity and impurity is not a feature of reality itself, but only of the concepts we form about reality, and it is therefore difficult to evade in a discussion, which must necessarily work with the dualism inherent in conceptual thought.

⁴⁹ The locus classicus for this is *Kīrtanatantra* 3.26–7. Cf. also SANDERSON (1982), p. 282–287.

tion is not easily answered, as it presupposes the monists' theory of ritual interpreted as knowledge and related issues.⁵⁰ But there is a detailed discussion of the problem of purity in the TĀ, which I shall briefly summarize. The pan-Indian concept of purification is applied in the *śaurāṅgika* (e.g. 4.118ab), but not without translation into the realm of cognition. The reason given for this is the illogicality inherent in the concept of purification and the scriptural injunction that all rules concerning religious practice are invalid at the highest level. The crucial passage from the eighteenth chapter of the *Mālinīnīra*, which is discussed in TĀ 4.212cd–275, starts with: "Here [on this level of practice] there is no purity or impurity." (MVT 18.74a) The analysis then starts with the question of whether purity and impurity belong to the nature of an object. If they did, purification would amount to a change of the nature of a thing, which is impossible. Moreover, if we were to subscribe to a materialistic theory of purification, we would have to assume substances that would be at the same time pure, as they would purify objects lower on the *tattva* scale, as well as impure, as they themselves could be purified by those above them. But apparently the concept of religious purity does not allow of such a relativism. If we were to suppose that nirvāṇas are the cause of purity,⁵¹ then it should be their identity with Śiva which effects the purification. But in this case everything else would be equally pure through being identical with Śiva as the light of manifestation and the concept itself would thus be rendered invalid.⁵² But in the monism it is their consciousness of the nature of Śiva that constitutes their purity and likewise all levels of reality can be pure, if only the Yogī recognizes their identity with Śiva. With this argument purity has become a form of knowledge and has been transferred from the object to the subject.

verse 108

In Abhinava's use *randhya* ("barren") is far from its literal meaning, for a more natural translation: "although he is completely unable to produce diversity" is excluded by being in contradiction with his philosophy.

It should be noted that the question concerned the problem of impurity, but

⁵⁰ The question concerning initiation is dealt with only in the second part of the *Viṃśatī* (II/52–154). For the theory of ritual from a non-dualist perspective, see SANDERSON (1995).

⁵¹ This way, shows the relevance of this discussion for initiation, where the monism at the words for purification.

⁵² According to Jayaratha the aim is not to prove the invalidity of the concept itself, but to demonstrate on the highest level of practice.

the answer is about duality. I do not think that Abhinava is trying to evade the problem: for the Kaṇḍas the transcendence of purity and impurity is non-duality put into practice (*nirvāṇa-dharma*).

verses 109–110ab

The appearance of duality in non-duality does not itself constitute *saṃsāra*. It is only by forgetting the real identity of the appearance as light that souls become "bound". To distinguish between pure and impure is a symptom of *anāhata*, and its absence prior that one has risen beyond it.⁵³

As defined in the Trika *māhā* is not a kind of delusion, but the perception of something as different from consciousness (*bhūtināyāpāra*). Similarly ignorance (*avidyā*) is not absence of knowledge, but incomplete knowledge.

verses 110cd–112ab

We cannot accuse the author of being prolix here. He will come back to the concept of "anxiety" or "inhibition" in the next verse, but here he is trying to answer the serious objection of not being in accord with scripture.

This Śāstra can only mean the *Mālinī*, but I have not been able to find a "bhagavadgītā" there. We could suspect a lost passage or just a very free paraphrase, but it is more likely a variant reading for MVT 1.4, which runs in all the sources:⁵⁴ *bhagavat yogusamsiddhikāṅkṣho yavan āgataḥ*. With this verse – as well as MVT 1.10a – the whole Āgama is put into the right perspective for Abhinavagupta, since it indicates in the very beginning that the main aim of this Śāstra is not liberation through action, i.e. ritual, but through Yoga. His reading *bhagavadgītā* could add another important point, namely that yoga is to be understood as a unification (*yujir yoge*) with Śiva and not just a kind of trance (*yuj samādhi*) that could accommodate different concepts of liberation.⁵⁵

Verses 111cd–112ab describe the method of teaching a non-dualistic doctrine under these conditions, that is, to disciples who are bound by dualistic thoughts. It is to take into account all dualistic notions and to dispel them by minute anal-

⁵³ Cf. the role of the "consumption of a sacramental impurity" in the unconventional initiation of the non-dualists. See SANDERSON (1995), p. 46.

⁵⁴ Somadev VAST DEV, who is preparing a critical edition of the NVT, kindly informed me that according to the sources available at the moment there is no such variant in the transmission of the *Viṃśatī*. A confusion of the ligatures of *cha* and *ya* in Śāradī is however conceivable.

⁵⁵ Different types are mentioned, for instance, in the *Śivapāraṇhita* (p. 341): *atpatti*, *saṃkīrti*, *śamāveśa* and *abhiyoga*.

With this definition he is able to explain that the Śāstra uses dualistic terminology only in order to transcend it.

verses 112*cd*–114

In a system of non-duality the concept of unification (yoga) itself has to be reinterpreted, since there is no way one can "enter" into Bhairava, or remain⁵⁷ in him, for this would imply a duality of the soul and Śiva. In the formulation of the Pratyabhijñā the soul can only recognize its true nature to be Śiva, and consequently the Trika had to reinterpret both ritual and meditation as encapsulating this knowledge. The unity with Śiva cannot be produced, as it is already there, but, unlike the Siddhānta, which held the view that ignorance was caused by a substance-like covering of the soul that had to be removed by an action [i.e. ritual], it conceived of the obstacles in more psychological terms:

Therefore repeated practice serves to obliterate the identification with the state of being the [artificial] subject [centred in the] body etc.,⁵⁸ but not in order to attain the [real] identity which is always (?) the essence of manifestation.⁵⁹

On a more philosophical level the same principle can be applied. As duality is a given fact, it would neither be possible nor make sense to teach non-duality directly. The dualistic concepts have to be analysed to be finally negated.

To summarize: the opponent's question (107) is dealt with in two ways: firstly, ritual is not the primary concern of the *Mālinī*, but Yoga; secondly, it is unnecessary for didactic reasons to suppose duality. This means that even if large parts of the *Mālinī* are dualistic and advocate ritual action, only portions or even single statements in the text that deal with Yoga and negate the dichotomies of ordinary religious life (pure/impure, etc.) represent the actual, non-dualistic doctrine of the Tantra, i.e. its Kaula essence.

verses 115–116

The first line is problematic. *yāmadgaṇ* could be translated as "by all means", "as far as possible",⁶⁰ but judging from the context I think that Abhinava is trying to stand against the non-dualistic Vedānta here and to define his *advaitavādhya* as inclusive. For him duality is always present as an appearance in the non-dual ground, duality is therefore not entirely rejected, one does not remain aloof (*vikṣipta*) and ignores it, but sees it for what it is: an expansion of one's own self.⁶¹

116 makes it clear that a vedāntic conception of non-duality would devalue most of the doctrinal constants of Śaiva theology, such as the "levels of reality" (*tattva*). If liberation were conceived of as the obliteration of all duality, the thirty-five *tattvas* below Śiva would be utterly useless.

I could not find any indication in the text that Abhinavagupta wanted to discuss or reject Sāṃkhya doctrine with "twenty-five" *tattvas* in 116*c*; it is more likely that a scribe did not understand the significance of the number "thirty-five" in the context and "corrected" it.

verse 117

An Indian commentary might introduce this verse with the objection that if duality somehow remains all one's life, what is the point of being liberated in life. Apparently it is the absence of the fear or inhibition, which we have described as a symptom of *saṃsāra*, that defines the liberated state, rather than the mere absence of duality.

verse 118

The Ka reads 118*c* as a compound.

I have eventually decided to cut through the Gordian knot by reversing the position of *śud* and *yat*.

The *Vijñānabhairava* is important for Abhinavagupta's Trika in as much as it lends scriptural support for higher non-ritualistic levels inside the Trika, characterized by an increasing "essentiality". This perspective emerges from the introductory part of this Tantra, where every "structured form" of the deity is called an illusion, taught only to provide those who are unable to grasp the formless deity with some "means of concentrating their awareness in meditation."⁶² The

⁶⁰ Bhāskara glosses it once as *vivādhapāyam*. See below.

⁶¹ IPK 4.1.12: *sarva nānātmya vāhva hy eva pañjanataḥ | śivātānava vikalpānān pū-*

ṣaṇṇa |

⁶² See SANDERSON (1990b), p. 74–76.

the *Yāmala*[tantras] (see *Vijñānabhairava* 1) are therefore
 necessary for the movement from duality to non-duality, as ex-
 plicitly stated in the *Yāmala* 1.1.1. The non-duality has to start from duality.

the verse from Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa's *Śivacintāmaṇi* is quoted in IPV 1.2.1 in Bhaṭṭa Kāṇḍha's *Citāmbodhaśāstra* 2.165 (p. 38).¹⁰ The introductory verse to this chapter of the IPV the author accords a metaphysical necessity to the opponent's view (*pūrvapakṣa*), namely as that which is refuted by Śaṅkara in order to dispel it:

Wherefore Srī Śaṅkara manifests everything in division as the *pūrṇapakṣa* and therefore as the non-duality as the correct view.⁶³

Bhaskara, the commentator on Abhinavagupta's *Vimarsīni*, develops the idea significantly further by calling, in his introductory verse on the same chapter, non-dualism the 'golden argument':

We are Siva, who after destroying duality as the *pūrāpākṣa* with the
 3.3.3. view of non-duality, finally adopts the highest [i.e. inclusive] non-

...the principle is not only applied to philosophical views, but also to religious practice. In his commentary on Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa's verse Kṣemarāja introduces the quest on why, if only knowledge is effective, ritual is taught at all.

It according to the [Advaita]Vedānta everything is part of the Lord, then why is not only knowledge taught in the portions [of authoritative texts] that deal with action,⁶⁵ and [furthermore] how can [action] be [taught and] even forbidden in the portions dealing with knowledge ...⁶⁶

The verses before in the *Śaivacintāmaṇi* the three Vedas had been mentioned and the commentary therefore applies the idea to the Vedānta by following the

IPV on 12, vol. 1, p. 51

b = a + dg would be enough and should alone be taught.

a = tenas riam bhavanamivam, tat karmat karmakundesa jñāse
e = jñanakundesa tad eva mādhyata ni samikṣanti samat -
taman . art. p. 79

context, but in the *Varnika* it is obviously applied to different layers within the *ṣaṅga* and more specifically within the *Trika*.⁶⁷

verses 121–122*ab*

The “participation of the *adhvani*”, as part of the Śaiva initiation, is only possible if the teacher becomes one with Śiva in order to initiate the disciple’s soul with the higher levels of reality. A purely dualistic theory must therefore leave part of the efficacy of initiation unexplained. This answers the objection raised in 110.

verse 122*cd*

The opponent seems to follow up to this point, but takes exception to the word “only”.

verse 123

This definition of non-duality might be seen as contradictory to the preceding. A traditional commentator would probably say that the present verse describes ultimate reality, where there is no more question of *heya* and *upādeya*, but the previous section had described the way to this goal by refutation of duality.

Here the qualification of this doctrine of non-duality as “supreme” is crucial. On the one hand non-duality is only conceivable as an *uttarapakṣa*, an antithesis to dualism. On the other hand it cannot continue to stand in opposition to it, as this opposition would itself disprove non-duality:

“But non-duality is not taught by us to be the exclusion of duality; this would only prove your position, for then the duality would be explicit. That in which [the notions] ‘this is duality’, ‘this is not duality’ and ‘this is duality plus non-duality’ equally appear is what is called non-duality.”⁷⁰

This supreme non-duality is a philosophical position which is able to accommodate everything.⁷⁰

verse 124

GNOLI translates the verse, reading the transmitted *rasān*, as follows: “Dal punto di vista del dualista, tutte le cose sono invece confinante in se stesse, e quindi, la non-dualit... non può fare altro, a mio parere, che un buco nell’acquedotto.”⁷¹ Given the economy of Abhinava’s style it is, I think, less likely that the

⁷⁰ na hi raktamni dravarasabaddhāmadhātve utvate | tadvakyaṃpaganau hy eṣa rāḍ dravaṃ tad dha vāpīṇam | dant dravām idam neti tad idāṃ ca dravādātaram | it para samam bhavati tad adhvam adhvānam |, MVV 1.628–9.

⁷¹ *ut anuvedhātām pakṣam*, MVV 1.631; *vīśāṃgerbhāṇukam* MVV 1.118. See also in the second *lāṇḍa* of the *Vṛṇṇika*, vs. 42, 151 and 329.

GNOLI (1979) p. 41.

sakho ‘you’ should be used in such a weak sense. Moreover I doubt that the Sanskrit shares the idiom ‘un buco nell’ acquedotto’⁷² and therefore propose to read *rasān* in the sense of “automatically”.⁷³

bhedāyate is therefore not a causative, but a denominative and a confusion of the two can explain the variant *rasān* as a attempt to provide the accusative object. Provided the interpretation is correct, the verse would work very well with 105 in trying to explain why this peculiar non-dualism cannot be easily understood from the perspective of dualism.

Abhinava therefore says in the IPV:

As we will state later the “consciousness” that can be expressed refers to objectivity, because it becomes the object of differential thought and, since it is created, is not the highest consciousness. The same applies to its [other] names: “agent of action and cognition” and “god”. Therefore one should strive by all means to avoid the fault of degradation through becoming an object. [...] But for the purpose of instruction it is impossible to avoid completely that it becomes an object.⁷⁴

verses 125–126

For *alan*, see p. 53.

The two verses form a couplet in a new metre and, judging from the contents, the variation of form here indicates a summary. The first verse ends the discussion on non-duality and recapitulates the statements concerning the relationship between consciousness, i.e. Śiva, and time. The second rephrases the important concept of an appearance of duality within non-duality.

In the part of the text discussed here the *prākṛti* is mentioned in 160*a*, 249*a* and 347, where it refers more or less directly to the doctrine of the five streams, but in the section preceding 126 the author was still discussing the nature of knowledge itself and its relation to time as a preliminary to that.

126*d* and the following line in brackets are problematic: the unmetrical *svāntaryāt* could be corrected, for instance to *nirapekṣam*, but the chances of

⁷² Provided my interpretation of the Italian as being equivalent with German: “ein Schlag ins Wasser” is correct.

⁷³ *rasān* is used by the author in TĀ 37.39 and 4.115; *rasān rasān* in PTV, p. 216 (“spiritualism”); GNOLI (1985), p. 137. Cf. also the use of *śarāṣatāḥ* in TĀV 15.47.

⁷⁴ *janayā hi tadvakyaṃ na raktamni dravarasabaddhāmadhātve utvate | tadvakyaṃpaganau hy eṣa rāḍ dravaṃ tad dha vāpīṇam | dant dravām idam neti tad idāṃ ca dravādātaram | it para samam bhavati tad adhvam adhvānam |, MVV 1.628–9.*

III Commentary

than a merely metrically possible reading with the same sense. The line that follows in all sources cannot be anything but a scribal gloss, since of the way it refers to the preceding verse.

verse 125

In *prāṇa bhāvaḥ* *esa* is emphatic (cf. so 'ham APTE (1986), s.v. *rod*, no. 5); "this I which is manifold".

'Matra and Caitra' means 'anyone' and *-prāyaḥ* adds the sense of approximation.

This question is only a modification of the previous one on omniscience. If consciousness is undivided and present in all subjects, and, moreover, source of the powers of cognition and action, then an intersubjective identity in action and even in knowledge is inexplicable.

ekaghaṇabhāvaḥ could mean "a homogeneous awareness of being", but, in order to indicate the implicit duality, "becoming" is preferable. For the problem of the opponent is not the awareness of unity, but the different scope of knowledge in subjects that are ultimately identical with Śiva.⁷⁵

verse 128

As so often, Abhinava starts his answer by bewailing the stupidity of the opponent. He then affirms his radical theory of manifestation: the opponent's question is not valid, because it refers to something inside manifestation, but it has never been denied that duality exists in manifestation. It has only been stated that this duality is, however real, on a very different level than non-duality.

The main misunderstanding of the opponent, from this perspective, lies in his unwillingness to acknowledge the fundamental priority of a light that is utterly unobjectifiable. The question is inappropriate in as much as it presupposes that the qualities of this light are to be found equally in all its manifestations.

verse 129

This verse is too elliptic to be sure about the interpretation: *nanu* might start a question and *naiva* the answer. But the next verse elaborates on the concept

⁷⁵ A grammatical term *bhāvaḥ* describes also a 'process' activity (Pāṇini 3.3.11). See Einar K. VITTHAL, article III: Essays in Honour of Nils Sundesson, Ed. by Einar K. VITTHAL, Oxford: The Institute for Comparative Research in Human Culture 1986, p. 115ff. Compare also AGOSTINI, W. 2011, *Bestimmung und Aufgabe der Funktion von Sekundär-Suffixen* nach Pāṇini, Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag 1975, p. 99f, where *bhāva* is translated as 'being' (p. 103).

5 The Five Powers

18

of "possession" (*manakāra*) and suggests that the emphasis is on the notion of "mine". The syntax (*man me*) would work very well with this assumption. Understood in this way the verse would mean that the mere process of perception or appearance of a thing that is seen as the manifestation of consciousness does not entail any duality. It is only the notion that something *belongs* to oneself and not to others which creates a division that misrepresents reality.

verse 130

Dyaipāyana might stand for Durvāsa in a Śaiva context, the Ṛṣi, whose mind-born sons, according to the legend related in *Śivadr̥ṣṭi* 7.107ff (quoted in TĀV 1.8), were the source of the threefold Śaiva revelation. But here it is a reference to the *Bhagavadgītā*,⁷⁶ where "manakāra" is mentioned in 2.71, 12.13 and 18.53 (*mānasa*). In his commentary on the *Bhagavadgītā* Abhinavagupta sees this sense even in the *ulānakālī* ("our people" or "selfish") in the initial verse of the text. This unobtrusive reference to the *Gītā* is used to prove that such a doctrine is to be found even on the most general level of scriptures.

verses 131–132

This verse is to be connected with 125, where the relationship between consciousness and time was mentioned as the main topic. It tries to reconcile the notion of time as a differentiating force with the indivisibility of consciousness through the *saṃśaraṇānukaravāda*, the doctrine that everything consists of everything.⁷⁷ This doctrinal peculiarity explains why the fullness of consciousness persists within differentiation.

The phrase *kālakalūṇā* in 131a is an echo of *Vijñānabhairava* 14. For the root *kal* and its interpretation, see commentary on 90f.

⁷⁶ Cf. Abhinavagupta's *Gīṭābhāṣya* (1986), introductory verse 2: *dharmasūtra manasā* (p. 103).

⁷⁷ See TORILLO (1987), WILZLER (1982), WILZLER (1992) and WILZLER (1981).

The Five Streams of the Śāstra

6.1 Kula

There can be difference in unity and simultaneity. For
the formation without division, he takes up the proposition
about the threefold nature of the universe and applies it

[illegible]

... truth more completely than those positioned on lower levels.

started with the Trika through defining its characteristic
of the three powers that defines the highest undifferentiated state
in the Kula. But in fact the relationship between the differ-
ent more intricate, as we are moving from the "highest Tri-
ka" concept that is probably without a socio-religious
plane within the Trika.

The Five Streams of the Jāna

The fact that a third-party logic, namely logic, is a
 reified reality, is more on the mind of the opponent
 for the doctrinal background on which times I deal with
 which belongs in some sense to the creed of the Trinitarian
 and that the first part of the *Vindicta* is a systematic
 of the *Sa*, but a complicated argumentation to
 the highest position. Through the discrepancy
 and the vagueness of its references to temporal
 and sometimes unconnected

[illegible]

135cd 134ab attempt to devalue time as an objective reality by denying it in the process of creation: the process of emission is not something that takes place in time, but the differentiation involved in this process produces information as a by-product.

6.2 Time

The opponent does not accept this paradoxical account and confronts our author with a common-sense definition of time

The convenient, but ungrammatical singular *vihhapatte* can be justified by taking "past" and "future" as separate since their boundaries to the present lie at opposite ends.

...ing with *extra* has to be supplied. I understand *ta* to mean that there were a real dividing line between past, present and future, and there be a division of one object from the other. The notion of duality which constitutes the world has been divided into past, present and future. That means that the world could not be explained. Abhinavagupta has merely a qualifier of things, was stated earlier (TS 1.1.1).

6.1 The Obliteration of Time in the Krama

The Krama is a system of Kālī worship and is the most heterogeneous system used by Abhinavagupta.¹ For its transmission, the Krama, "esoteric", and discussion of its doctrine is by a remark about its secrecy. Central to its doctrine is the notion of *śrāma* of deities that describe the process of power, immersion in content, immersion in content, retraction of content, immersion within the subject, and finally the dissolution of content. In some traditions, pure luminosity (*bhāva*) is the phase englobing these four as its creative vibrancy.² The Krama system frequently play on the symbolism of the sun, which is the process of knowing and their metaphorical representation of knowledge is called "fire", as it "incinerates" the object of knowledge and continuously obliterates duality in the process of perception.³ Knowledge is called the "sun", because it is present in every new perception.⁴ Knowledge itself is the "moon" which is the object, and the object of knowledge itself is the "moon" which is the perceiver. These identifications then allow the writer to play on the dual symbolism of the sun, marking the outer realm and more importantly its division into months etc., is naturally connected to the sun. In the process of perception it symbolizes the eleven senses (the five senses, five of action, plus the mind) and *buddhi* (=prākāśa). The Krama with its sixteen parts is represented as the "circle of bliss" (*ānanda*).

...of the *prākāśa*, but with *buddhi* and *manas*. For the present purpose it may be stated that it is a condensed description of the process of perception.

...and resorb the object through the sun, which is the instrument of perception and which consists of twelve parts.

...because it vibrates with the awareness of the sun, which is the instrument of perception. Every object to some extent (*ta* = "blue", "red", "yellow", etc.) fill it, that is hold it in existence for some time, and resorb it, i.e. destroy it by the instrument of the sun, i.e. the instrument of knowledge, which is completely replete form, as it consists of twelve parts. The Krama is called *prākāśa* (of sound) from "a" to *śrāma* which are the "barren" sounds and which is devoted to initial effort, *śrāma* (*śrāma*), that is by being directed to the outside world, which is manifest objects. This is the sense.

The Tā then goes on to describe the "moon" as that which devours this environment, and is the "moon" into the fire of knowledge. The same metaphor is used in the following verses in the *Vārtika*, where the author tries to show that the practice of meditation as described in the Krama is a state of consciousness in which time is transcended.

¹ The Krama is a system of Kālī worship and is the most heterogeneous system used by Abhinavagupta. For its transmission, the Krama, "esoteric", and discussion of its doctrine is by a remark about its secrecy. Central to its doctrine is the notion of *śrāma* of deities that describe the process of power, immersion in content, immersion in content, retraction of content, immersion within the subject, and finally the dissolution of content. In some traditions, pure luminosity (*bhāva*) is the phase englobing these four as its creative vibrancy. The Krama system frequently play on the symbolism of the sun, which is the process of knowing and their metaphorical representation of knowledge is called "fire", as it "incinerates" the object of knowledge and continuously obliterates duality in the process of perception. Knowledge is called the "sun", because it is present in every new perception. Knowledge itself is the "moon" which is the object, and the object of knowledge itself is the "moon" which is the perceiver. These identifications then allow the writer to play on the dual symbolism of the sun, marking the outer realm and more importantly its division into months etc., is naturally connected to the sun. In the process of perception it symbolizes the eleven senses (the five senses, five of action, plus the mind) and *buddhi* (=prākāśa). The Krama with its sixteen parts is represented as the "circle of bliss" (*ānanda*).

earlier" in the sequence of creation, as their doctrine is ranked as higher. Such a sequence of the six *śrotas* is reflected in the hierarchy of initiations. Even if the details of the different lists have to be brought into agreement,²⁸ it is apparent that the highest level is occupied by the initiation of the Trika and different modes [Mata, Kaula, Kula] which have no direct correspondence in the system of the *pañcavratas*, but which could, for the time being, be treated as subdivisions of the Trika. This is followed by the Dakṣiṇa, the Vāma and, finally, the Siddhānta. Presumably the remaining two streams, namely that of the Gāṇḍa- and Bhūtalantras, were without a religious correlate at the time of Abhinavagupta and are therefore left out of consideration. As our author says in TĀ 13.321, a person initiated in the "earlier" (*pūrvam*) stream is authorized to perform initiation in those below, but not vice versa, *pūrvavīrdha* therefore means the three higher parts of the six streams: *ūrdhvarūdrha* (the sixth stream), the Dakṣiṇa and the Vāma. The trinity formed by Īśana [=Siddhānta], Vāma and Dakṣiṇa in a second step is an attempt on the side of the Trika to encompass the whole spectrum of Tantric Śaivism, i.e. down to the Siddhānta. It is the definition of Trīśirobhairava, but not of *śaḍardha*.

The position of *alanī* at the end of 165d connects the idea that it is adequate to describe Trika as "half of six" with the next verse, where he justifies this interpretation by saying that it is not an arbitrary variant in order to keep the doctrine obscure, for if it had been, then other, more complicated, variants for *śaḍardha* should also be in use.

6.4.1 Yāmala

verses 167–168

For the conjecture in 168b, see SANDERSON (1986), p. 186.

The author now reverts to a description of layers that are as it were inserted between the equilibrium of the powers that defines the Trika and the fivefold expansion. This gradation is reflected in the construction of the Trika's *śaṣṭiśāiva* in which the Matayāmala is slightly below the Trika:

"In the (Śaiva)-Siddhānta the throne culminates in the (nine) Powers of Gnosis. In the Vāma and the Dakṣiṇa schools it is extended to incorporate Śaḍāśiva. In the Matayāmala it rises above Śaḍāśiva to end in the Croscious (*śamudra*). Here in the Trika it goes even further, ending only in the Transmental (*tanumanā*)."²⁹

²⁸ See SANDERSON (1997) for a detailed treatment of the issue.
²⁹ Translation of TĀ 15.319f. as given in SANDERSON (1986), p. 181.

Matayāmala, as argued by SANDERSON,³⁰ stands for the *Picumatatratuna-yāmala*, an unedited Śaivatantra that survives in manuscripts.

"This central stream of revelation is identified by Abhinavagupta as the Kaula, that mystico-erotic tradition which pervades the higher reaches of the Bhairava-teachings and has indeed expressed its relation to the Vāma and Dakṣiṇa by combining the goddesses of both in some of its rituals. The Yāmala teachings (represented here by the *Picumata-Brahmayānala*) fit perfectly into this hermeneutical 'rise of kundalini'. For they are located by Abhinavagupta in this duality-devouring stream of the Kaula centre at the point at which the perfect fusion of Vāma, Dakṣiṇa and Kaula, claimed as its own by the Trika, is yet to be fully realized."³¹

6.5 The Five Faces of Śaḍāśiva

verses 169–171ab

The translation of *prthaghāyavagāṣa* may seem forced, but the first meaning that comes to mind for *prthaghāyā*, "separateness", would be redundant.

Among the names for the five powers *vidā* is just an infrequent variant³² for *pāda*, but *spanda* for *ānanda* is anomalous.

Having described the inclusive trinity of powers right from the beginning and having assigned a slightly lower slot to the Yāmala, the author now wishes to explain the transition from the non-dual cults to the "outside", i.e. to the pan-Śaiva model of the evolution of scripture characterized by the pentad of powers. He does so by emphasizing again and again that, although the pentadic form is somehow built into the structure of powers, their actual division involves more of the appearance of duality; a higher degree of limiting adjuncts (*upādhi*), and takes place on a much lower level of the universe. For the first time in the text our author identifies the five streams of the Śāstra with the five *mantras*, i.e. faces of Śiva. In order to emphasize the structural principle on this layer of the universe he adds another pentad, namely that of the five *aṅgamantras*.

³⁰ SANDERSON (1986), p. 183f.

³¹ SANDERSON (1986), p. 186.

³² *śaḍāśiva* *śaḍāśiva* in *medas*, see *Vācaspatyaṁ*, s.v.

verses 171cd 174ab

The purpose of the following verses is to differentiate this intermediate state from the manifestation of the levels below *māyā*. In contradistinction to *spanda*, which is defined as an indistinct vibration, the *sphāra* mentioned here allows of some activity, but is to be distinguished from the "normal" activity of the *śaiva isakti* in the "impure path" (*asuddhādhāra*) of the universe.

6.6.1 Non-duality of Action

The last line is an attack on the Siddhānta model of creation, according to which Śiva is not in contact with the impure levels of the universe. There follows a description of the *śaiva* model of creation, in which the universe is created by a liberated soul, Ananta, who is vested with power and authority by Śiva. It is not possible to counter the Siddhānta in this point directly, as MVT 2.24c-25 contains one of the classical formulations of the doctrine that is quoted even by dualists. But from the perspective of the *śaiva* doctrine that is quoted even by dualists, because it presupposes an influence of Śiva on the Siddhānta model is flawed, because it presupposes an influence of Śiva on the *śaiva* model. The following verses are devoted to this topic by denouncing

verses 176-179

The quotation in *ITV* is from the lost *Tatstiracrañtanīyama* by Kallata and appears also in the *PTV* and the *TĀ*.³³ In the context of the *Tatstiracra* our authors tries to get a slightly different meaning out of the quotation. It occurs in a passage that describes the gradual obliteration of duality. In this process of meditative awareness of perception, differential thought (*vikalpa*) as well as the *nīti*, i.e. the sixteen moments of a perception, decrease and the thought-free awareness of the perceiver emerges (*TA* 10.200). The entry into Śiva has only two *nīti*, one correlated with the owner of the power (*sakāminī*) and one with power itself. One should concentrate on the second to gain omniscience and power to act (207). Because the first is merely the full and undifferentiated consciousness, in which no objects and actions are possible (209). It thus transcends the world and is not useful for the Yoga of the Śaiva householder envisaged by Abhinava. For this concentration on the second *nīti*, he quotes Kallata and understands *nīpātā* as the 'elapse of the (first) *nīti*, i.e. the 'second'.

In 178d the meaning of *prakarsati* and the comparison of the mind with a sword is not clear. From the examples that follow, we can infer that the mind is able to extract details of perception in "no time", but applied to the sword the image is difficult to interpret.

¹¹ *śādhakāḥ śikṣakāḥ pādāḥ tuṣṭipāṭe sarvasvīyatvasaravakarivāḥ* āhūti, PTV, p. 103. And Tā
 arṇha cetaḥ sam kaliteṣu śrīmān tuṣṭipāṭaḥ lābhaḥ sarvasvīyukṛtye tuṣṭi pāṭe 'pura naiti'
 1028¹². DIVEDĀ (1938a) adopts the reading from the PTV in his collection of citations
 from *śaṭi works*, but Javantha's commentary (TĀV 10, 208) has again a different reading
śaṭi tuṣṭipāṭaḥ śrīmān tuṣṭipāṭe sarvasvīyatvāḥ nī.

In this context, as the line should give the reason why adherents are excluded from true liberation in the next verse. Śaṅkara does not want to say that the Vaiṣṇava's religious practice is actually *śuddha*, but rendered ineffective because they pretend to be pure. It is more sense to assume that it is the failure of lower doctrines that the higher is not different from the pure and to pretend that their practice is based in and leads to a freedom from impurity. The expression *śuddha* would therefore refer to their inability to transcend the pure and impure.

The word *śuddha* serves to emphasize that their true religious identity is not in the lower doctrines. Whatever the outer practice for reasons of convenience may be, it is the internal practice that defines the true status. The construction of the passage is odd. We would expect the construction to be like those who are fixed in other doctrines [...] are not liberated. Those who are consecrated as Śaivas too are not liberated. The reader would then deduce a difference between *śaivāstika* and *śaivāstika* *samyak dṛṣṭvā* that would be accumulated by the reader. It is difficult to maintain such an interpretation; neither is it possible to give *śaivāstika* a sense so different from *śaivāstika* as would justify this interpretation.

The passage states the difference between the liberating Śaiva religion and the lower doctrines that do not access to merely incomplete liberation. But within the Śaiva religion there is a difference between the systems. As Śaṅkara bases his exegesis "our systems", i.e. Advaita, on the "other streams": the first strive for liberation in life, while the others promise final liberation at death.³⁶

The word *śaivāstika* is mentioned here explicitly under the heading "Śaivāstika". Śaṅkara's interpretation of *śaivāstika* as "one who follows the

stream taught by Śiva", rather than "the worshipper of Śiva", for the second meaning does not apply to the *śaivāstika* with its pantheon of exclusively female deities.

The two verses contrast two different systems, in which liberation in life is not possible. With the Śaivāstika, the reliance on complicated ritual makes liberation impossible.

The word *śaivāstika* is used at the end of the previous verse and to show that because the Śaivāstika will eventually reach the highest fruit, their practice must reflect some of the characteristics of the higher. Kaula stream is mentioned in the text as *śaivāstika* and refers to *sambhadrāstika*. Literally, "the doctrine of dissolution" could in the next verse refer to the doctrine of purification with a series of gradually higher virtues. This approach is consistent with the "order of dissolution" that is the process of progressively dissolved in the higher. From the context it is clear that this must refer to the Śādhānta and the practice, which is not a doctrine and be provided by the identification of the identity of the Śādhānta. Śaṅkara's with *nimesa* in IPK 3.1.3.

Śaṅkara refers to the Śādhānta in the *śaivāstika*, a Śādhāntika scripture composed by Bhagavataśāstra.³⁷ The passage, which according to Śaṅkara deals with the *śaivāstika*, mentions an initiation that is based on the elements as identified in the five *kalas*.³⁸ After this identification

the *śaivāstika* would even initiate outcastes.³⁹

Śaṅkara interprets the word *śaivāstika* as "The sense of 'one could even initiate outcastes' is hyperbolic, as the sense of a verb connected to the word *ap* is hyperbolic, as the word *ap* can even split a mountain with one's

The word *śaivāstika* is used at the end of the previous verse and to show that because the Śaivāstika will eventually reach the highest fruit, their practice must reflect some of the characteristics of the higher. Kaula stream is mentioned in the text as *śaivāstika* and refers to *sambhadrāstika*. Literally, "the doctrine of dissolution" could in the next verse refer to the doctrine of purification with a series of gradually higher virtues. This approach is consistent with the "order of dissolution" that is the process of progressively dissolved in the higher. From the context it is clear that this must refer to the Śādhānta and the practice, which is not a doctrine and be provided by the identification of the identity of the Śādhānta. Śaṅkara's with *nimesa* in IPK 3.1.3.

as on would lead to an inconsistency in the interpretation of *upādhi*. The tentative structure of the question is therefore as follows. Limiting adjuncts only have an influence on reality, if we assume a division between Śiva and the world. This is of course strongly rejected by our author, but with an epoque terpret t n the following way: in the opponent's, i.e. the Sāiddhāntika's, account of creation there is a division between Śiva and the world, that means, from the perspective of the non-dualists, that the Sāiddhāntika's Śiva is not able to accommodate objects that undergo change. But as Śiva is an all-pervading reality, there must be a place of contact between the world and Śiva, and there we must assume – the objects are miraculously inactive, if Śiva's nature is to remain unchanged. With the absurdity of the idea proven, the author can affirm the unsurprising solution: the ontological status of Bhairava, as we have seen in previous passages dealing with the Pratyabhijñā theory of *abhāsa*, is radically different from manifestation and any influence of the manifested duality on the manifesting light is impossible. Therefore the reading of *Ked* in 203*d* has to be dismissed, as it does not provide an answer to the question in 200*d*. The answer cannot be the denial of *upādhis* and duality as in the *Ked*'s readings, but to show that all divisions are on the side of the appearances, and not on the side of the light.

verse 204

For the opponent the discrepancy between the appearance and its source as regards their qualities is not explained, unless one would regard the one as real and the other as unreal. But for Abhinavagupta reality is the appearance of God as a variety of forms.

verses 205–206*ab*

The opponent brings up a contradiction: if everything that appears is real, dreams too should be real, but dreams lack the causal efficiency that is characteristic of 'real things'. The author therefore ought to clarify his definition of reality and appearance. The issue is, however, not addressed here and the reader is referred to the section about dreams (921ff. 1000ff). There the waking state is defined as the appearance of a variety of manifest forms, whereas in the dream state appearances are unstable. Despite their fundamental identity as appearance, causal efficiency is limited to the realm of duality, which means to externally perceived things.⁵⁰

⁵⁰ See [1] for details.

6.7 Tatpuruṣa

verses 206*cd*–207*ab*

namo is here as in 92 and 386*d*, but unlike 197*c*, used for *cit*! In 933*a* too *prameya* seems to stand for *cit*, but there the case is even less clear, because *vechā* is not named and the series is used for a different argument, namely to describe the twelve Kṛmā deities as an extension of the five powers.

In the present case the reason for the choice of words might be the image of "awakening", i.e. the arising of the light in the east, where Tatpuruṣa resides. The metaphor of light is used for the description of the directions that come into being with the five faces, but this light is – if we are allowed to extend the image – not the light of knowledge emitted by the moon, but the light of the sun, in which objects are manifested, until they dissolve, when the sun sets in the west (Sadyojāta).

verses 207*cd*–209*ab*

The author now tries to explain the name "Tat-puruṣa" as 'its (i.e. the *īśvara*-*tanu*'s) perceiver'. The face is said to be "clearly recognizable", either because of the division between subject and object, or because it is the eastern face which is connected to the light. The details of this 'etymology' are however not clear.

It is noteworthy that neither of the usual sequences of the faces, the "vedic" starting with Sadyojāta, and the "vertical method" (*dayadabhang*) starting with Īvara are used here. The logic behind this sequence is probably to show that Īśāna, Tatpuruṣa and Sadyojāta form a group against the remaining three, namely *ānandavān*, Vāmadeva and Aghora.

verses 209*cd*–210*ab*

Here the fact that the *Gāṇḍatantras*, which deal with the cure of snake-bites etc., are associated with the eastern face has to be explained, but the logical connection to the previous verse, expressed by *ata eva*, is not evident.

verses 210*cd*–211

The *Gāṇḍatantras*, which would have to be dismissed as lower scriptures of purely magical, or medicinal value, acquire metaphysical legitimation in this account: their ability to avert negative influences is reinterpreted as a stabilization of a creation that is always in danger of falling back into non-duality, just like children are more easily seized by the nine *grahas*.

Missing the dichotomy that the teacher should expound the contents of scripture (*śāstra*) and *śāstra* does not provide us with the text, but only with a summary of *śāstra* (2.2ab). The connection of this quotation with the *śāstra* face may not be so evident, but becomes clearer if we look at TĀ 9.3.10. There the same line of the *Mahāv* is quoted for a definition of "superiority" as implying "the state of perceiving [the lower]" (*īryāpīṭhā*). According to Jayaratha superiority is a temporal or spatial category, but a gradation of quality. The higher is that which perceives the lower.⁵¹

6.8 Sadyojāta

Although this could be taken as an answer to the question in 200cd-201ab, it is part of the definition of Sadyojāta who is related to the power of volition (*icchākā*).

The idea of a disappearance of all objects in Sadyojāta is developed in order to explain the characteristic of a specific group of scriptures. We would expect that these refer to the *Bhūtatantras*, but there is no indication for that. The only correspondence that is established here is that between Sadyojāta and *anupāśya* mediated by *icchā*.⁵²

This short digression on reality, determinacy and the inconceivable power of God is perhaps motivated by the paradoxical description of Sadyojāta. It emphasizes the point that "unreal things" exist either as "real imaginations", or as appearances, and that Sadyojāta's sleep is therefore only apparent.

[illegible]

For ancient (2261) in the sense of "habituation", see PW which refers to *śāhāsārīṣaṅga* 24.95 etc.

janah sa in 226b could mean "you" as opposed to *ayun janah*, but the context suggests a more general statement.

It is tempting to understand *nughā* as "flood" and as referring to inundation.

but *kṛṣ* ("plough, till") would then have to be taken very inaccurately as "cultivate".

the comparison with the plantain whose stem is considered to be "without essence" (*asāra*) is more appropriate here.

For *umtānasthānam* in 226, cf. TĀV 28.396.

The reader will welcome the lively interruption at this point. The opponent – here we might better imagine one of his disciples – accuses him of repetition and the response is a string of comparisons that aim at justifying the recapitulation of crucial doctrines. Mere repetition is of course rejected by our author (e.g. in TĀ 37.31).

229 A similar comparison, with devotion as the axe, is to be found in *Hara vijaya* 47.31.

Without the conjecture in 230b the contrast expressed by *api* would be very weak indeed.

For the identification of *kupintha*, see MEULENBELD (1974), p. 536.
With verse 230 the author resumes the description of *Sadyojīta*. Although

the *Bhūtatantras* that are usually attributed to the Sadyojāta face are said to deal with exercises that

erworldliness of what might seem to be a Kāpālīka, or perhaps Pāśupata, prac-

But in the system of the *pañcasrotas* the Pāśupatas (*atimārga*) appear as associated with Tatpuruṣa, and this takes place on a different level

⁵¹ By the way, the stereocyste *lanthionylthiazine* occurs, for instance, in *Streptomyces*.

9.31e. In *Yogavāṇīśha*, *Nirvāṇaprakaraṇa*, pūrvārdha, 18.10a is applied to the mother. It could describe Aghora in *Netratantṛya* 9.24a, but there the matter is not so clear. It would assume that the mother is the one who is the object of the devotion.

each in 9.23-25ab, then the attribute could indeed apply to *Sadvijāta*! On the other hand,

... applies this description explicitly to Aghora in 10.4a.

Rather than referring to a specific group, this description seems to target *asveta* Saivism as opposed to the religion of the Śaivas in the world.⁵⁴ This would explain the critique that follows as an attempt to counter a possible objection to our author's yoga-based interpretation of the Tantra, namely that the domain of the Śaiva householder is not *yoga* or *jñāna*, but *karma*.

234*d* is marked by the editors of the *K*_{ed} with a question mark,

6.8.2 Critique of vairāgya

This critique of *vairāgya* is soon interrupted by a question, but taken up in the second Kāṇḍa of the *Vārttika*.

verse 235

There is a parallel in II.110–111, which attributes the idea to a “*guru*”.⁵⁵ It seems to be a critique of the concept of detachment (*vairāgya*) and the corresponding yogic technique of *pratyāhāra*. Our verse summarizes the idea that an active withdrawal from sense objects, thought to be facilitated by pain, cannot be successful because the mental flux does not even in pain come to a standstill: on the other hand it rests and becomes detached even from a pleasant experience, if satisfied through the knowledge of the object. The conclusion in the parallel in II.112 is that only a passive detachment can produce the falling away of mental activities. To try to actively “pull back” (*pratyahāra*) from mental activity, only “cements” one’s dependence on the mental flux. As mentioned by TORELLA,⁵⁶ the same idea is to be found in *Svabodhodayamañjarī* 12,⁵⁷ but one has to consider the possibility that the phrase goes back to MVT 3.6cd (quoted in ĪPVV III, p. 262).

verse 236

In this verse the author tries to adduce the *Yogasūtra* as support for the theory that knowledge is superior to detachment. 236 sums up *Yogasūtra* 1.15–16:

⁵⁴ As SANDERSON has shown, Abhinavagupta’s philosophy aims at the Śaiva householder, not at the ascetic (SANDERSON (1986), p. 202) and the higher levels of his Trika probabli Tantra’s asceticism with its insignia, i.e. matted locks etc. (SANDERSON (1997), fs 29).

⁵⁵ See commentary on 22.

⁵⁶ TORELLA (1994b), p. 491.

⁵⁷ *pratyahāraṇāṁ kṛtānāṁ vīryādyābhāsavatīkṛtāṁ | pratyakṣa nirāśāḥ ‘kām āśāśāśā’ apādiṣṭvair* (quoted with variants in TAV 4.257. This small work has appeared in print only in GOSWAMI (1989), but the text is unfortunately not yet published.

dyāvanvratavakroṣaiva ityāśasya vāśakārasaṅgāt vairāgyaḥ | 1.15
ut pāpam pūṣeakṣivīte ‘gūḥyante’nyam | 16

The translation of the passage is tendentious in order to make Abhinavagupta’s point clear, namely that knowledge (*khyāti*) is superior to detachment.

6.8.3 Excursus. The Motive for Creation

verse 237

The expression *vidhīm kṛpase*, lit. “if you are not offended”, occurs in ĪPV 1.5.12 (vol. I, p. 201).

Despite all efforts 237*cd* does not yield any sense – J1’s reading is only accepted for metrical reasons –, unless one would emend it beyond recognition. One can imagine that an elaborate word-game on duality or division was the source for the corruption, and that *akāṇḍe* in Pāda c is perhaps wrong for *akāṇḍe* (cf. TĀ 4.270a). The expression *khaṇḍanāḍāyī* in the answer would be in accord with this (241), but I would not hazard a guess at the reading.

verse 238

Evā mātī: see commentary on 124.

238c echoes the MVT’s description of *rāga*: *rāga* ‘pi *rañjayaṛy enam* *rahaḥgeṣv aśvateṣv apī* 1.28cd.⁵⁸

Despite the problematic line the argument seems to be clear: the opponent cannot reconcile a mind searching for pleasure with an eternally immaculate consciousness.

verse 239

The author did not forget the accusation of repetition, made by the opponent in 224*ab*, and sees his pedagogic approach justified.

verses 240–244

Yoga is understood as “manner”, “mode”.

vipaścitani is not attested in the dictionaries, but might be glossed as *vidyateṇ* (*prā*)*paścitani*. Cf. PTV p. 59: *tad eva āśāśābhīḥ vipaścitani in* and *harivṛṇaparīkṣāprakāśaḥ*, p. 88f.

The following passage tries to answer the objection made in 238, which concerned the contradiction between the natural “desire” of consciousness for objects, which are by nature impure, and its own purity. In 241 Abhinavagupta

⁵⁸ Adopting the variant in the edition, see also the quotation in TAV 9.200*ab*.

izes that the manifestation of duality in a non-dual reality does not bring about a division in the manifesting light itself. But in order to produce the appearance of duality, which is primarily the antagonism between the subject and the object of experience, the "power of Śiva" has to create lower states of consciousness, in which this duality can be perceived. Those states, i.e. consciousness as knowledge (*tuṭiṭṛṇā saṃyati*), naturally follows its objects, just like material forms are by nature inclined to dissolve into the elements from which they originated.

verses 245c1–246ab

A general example to explain why consciousness, because of its fullness, has the natural tendency to flow into lower states. The same idea is quoted in II. 100–101, but no source for the quotation is known.

verses 246cd–247ab

The opponent seems to accept the natural flow towards objects, but not its selectiveness. If this selectiveness is not due to any external influence, but to its own determination, it would follow that consciousness is necessarily connected to desire.

verses 247cd–248ab

Abhinavagupta cannot deny this, but phrases his acceptance very carefully, and then reinterprets this peculiar kind of *rāga* as merely the toleration of the influence of something else, rather than a *desire* for something.

6.9 Sadyojāta (continued)

verses 248cd–251ab

The opponent tries to stir up another contradiction, but the author is suddenly reminded of his main topic and goes on to explain the western face of Sadāśiva in the terminology of the process of perception. The passage describes how consciousness becomes contracted and is gradually emptied of all the parts involved in the process. The completion of it leaves the consciousness in a void similar to the state of dissolution at the end of a *kalpa*. This is then linked to Brahmā, the deity presiding over the resorption of the universe (*saṃhāna*).

verses 251cd–252

At this point the author provides us with an overview of the correspondence

between the causal deities (*kāraṇaśivān*) and the five faces in order to show that the description of Rudra refers to Sadyojāta. The future tense (*bhaviṣyati*) indicates that Vāmadeva and Aghora are still to be described.

The emendation of the transmitted reading *kojo* is based on the required sense "Brahmā". Abhinavagupta uses *abhiṣṭāh* (TĀ 26.2) for Brahmā, which does not help here except that it proves that he does not hesitate to play with words. To assume an error for *kojo* – which would be formed analogous to *sarajū*, which is attested as an epithet of Brahmā – is paleographically conceivable and furthermore restores a *no-*vipula** from a Pāṭhya Śloka.

This would lead to the following set of identifications:

Sadyojāta	Rudra
Tatpuruṣa	Īśvara
Īśāna	Sadāśiva
Vāmadeva	Vīṣṇu
Aghora	Brahmā

If we compare this list with the one given in the introduction, we note a transposition of Rudra and Brahmā. Since the identification of Sadyojāta with Rudra is corroborated by the wider context and cannot be due to textual corruption, we cannot but assume that our author has altered the identification, to which he in other places adheres.⁹⁹ to fit his context. That this should be done with such an important category is remarkable.

In the present context the use of these deities has notable implications. As the set of *kāraṇaśivān* sometimes includes *anīśrta* as the sixth, the identification hints at the correctness of the highest, sixth "stream" (*śrotas*) above Īśāna. It is perhaps also a way to suggest that *in a sense* Sadāśiva, who represents the Śaiva Siddhānta, is not the deity that – as in the Siddhānta model – encompasses the whole canon through its five faces, but that Sadāśiva's scope is really that of the Īśāna face, and that the other faces are open to a different exegesis, namely that of the Trika. In other words, to confine Sadāśiva to the upper face is to limit the influence of the dualistic Siddhānta to a part, which is

⁹⁹ Cf. *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* III, p. 309: *Ita eva brahmināḥ śaṣṭi vṛkṣaṅkṣya 'ndratāḥ' diva-
bhāṣāṁśvāṇāṁ sadāśivānāṁ śaṣṭiśāṁśvāṇāṁ 'anīśrta' vācāṁśvāṇāṁ 'anīśrta' vācāṁśvāṇāṁ
śaṣṭiśāṁśvāṇāṁ 'anīśrta' vācāṁśvāṇāṁ*. Here the sequence of causal deities corresponds to the nominal
sequence of faces beginning with Sadyojāta (see introduction). Five causal deities are men-
tioned here in 254, *Sāṁkhyaśāstra* 23.9cd–11 and *Netraṇṭara* 2.23. Compare also
Saṁkhyasūtra 2.23, *Nirvāṇasūtra* 233–236, and the list in BREUSNER-LACHATA
(1977), Appendix XI.

ing commentarial tradition on this Tantra,⁶⁹ one can only agree with the *Virtutis* for the explanation of the *vīṃśasrotas*. Was it seen to be a comparatively recent text that – despite propagating a pantheon that is quite different from Abhinavagupta's religious world – inherited material from the almost extinct *vīṃśasrotas*, such as this peculiar exegesis of *kāma*? This could at least explain why Abhinava quotes this Tantra, whose position in the Śaiva canon is marginal, "being known in this canon only to itself".⁷⁰

The two earliest commentaries on this text that survive are the *Rjvīṃśasrotas* by Śivānanda and Jayaratha's *Vīvarāja*. The verse in question is introduced with the assertion that merely by knowing this practise the mantra-practitioner is transformed into Kāma. Śivānanda then interprets the cryptic verse as describing the *yānta* of Kāmarāja and assigns its five parts, i.e. *kāmasaṅgha*, *kāmadhivasthā*, *kāmaśāntaśāpīṇīkṛtā*, *pāda* c and *pāda* d, to the five *hṛī* of Kāmarāja: *hṛīṇi kṛīm aīu bṛīṇi sṛīṇi*,⁷¹ which express the five forms of Kāma: *kāma*, *mānmatha*, *kāndarpa*, *śākaradhivā*, *mohana*.⁷²

verse 281

This reinterpretation of a key term of this system of the left stream is intended to show that "desire" – from the higher perspective of the *Trika* – describes not a technique to gain magical powers, which according to Abhinavagupta is the main aim in this part of the tradition, but in fact only an aspect of the all-encompassing process of perception: the appropriation and enjoyment of the object.

⁶⁹ SANDERSON (1990a), p. 157.

⁷⁰ SANDERSON (1990a), p. 157.

⁷¹ *śrīḥ aīuṃ saṃpravakṣyāmi pravṛṇu bhavi durlabham* ||44||

⁷² *veṇa vīṇāṃśasrotasā sādhuḥka mānmathasye* |

Rjvīṃśasrotas | *śrīḥ aīuṃ saṃpravakṣyāmi pravṛṇu bhavi durlabham* ||44||

veṇa vīṇāṃśasrotasā sādhuḥka mānmathasye | *Rjvīṃśasrotas* | *śrīḥ aīuṃ saṃpravakṣyāmi pravṛṇu bhavi durlabham* ||44||

veṇa vīṇāṃśasrotasā sādhuḥka mānmathasye | *Rjvīṃśasrotas* | *śrīḥ aīuṃ saṃpravakṣyāmi pravṛṇu bhavi durlabham* ||44||

veṇa vīṇāṃśasrotasā sādhuḥka mānmathasye | *Rjvīṃśasrotas* | *śrīḥ aīuṃ saṃpravakṣyāmi pravṛṇu bhavi durlabham* ||44||

veṇa vīṇāṃśasrotasā sādhuḥka mānmathasye | *Rjvīṃśasrotas* | *śrīḥ aīuṃ saṃpravakṣyāmi pravṛṇu bhavi durlabham* ||44||

veṇa vīṇāṃśasrotasā sādhuḥka mānmathasye | *Rjvīṃśasrotas* | *śrīḥ aīuṃ saṃpravakṣyāmi pravṛṇu bhavi durlabham* ||44||

veṇa vīṇāṃśasrotasā sādhuḥka mānmathasye | *Rjvīṃśasrotas* | *śrīḥ aīuṃ saṃpravakṣyāmi pravṛṇu bhavi durlabham* ||44||

veṇa vīṇāṃśasrotasā sādhuḥka mānmathasye | *Rjvīṃśasrotas* | *śrīḥ aīuṃ saṃpravakṣyāmi pravṛṇu bhavi durlabham* ||44||

veṇa vīṇāṃśasrotasā sādhuḥka mānmathasye | *Rjvīṃśasrotas* | *śrīḥ aīuṃ saṃpravakṣyāmi pravṛṇu bhavi durlabham* ||44||

verses 282–283ab in the *Netraṇṭra* (11.8) the *kumkara*s are part of the pantheon of Tumburu, i.e. the form of Śiva worshipped in the *vīṃśasrotas*.

verses 283cd–285ab

I am not sure whether my conjecture in 284a is beyond doubt, but the transmitted reading, i.e. "one pervades the body consisting of *prāṇa* and subtle body", is even more doubtful. The of *śrīṇi* in 284c is also suspicious.

verses 285cd–286ab

The text now turns to an explanation of the four powers that are present in the pantheon of Tumburu.

verses 286cd–287

It is clear that the four powers of Tumburu are reinterpreted in this passage as partly congruent with the standard set of five powers, but the *-vidikriyāḥ* in 286d poses some problems. *vidi* is the form of the root in the *Dhātupāṭha* (*vidi* *jñāne*) and a more natural translation would have to understand *vidikriyā* as the "act of knowing".⁷³ But as four powers are demanded by the context, *vidi* must stand for knowledge and *kriyā* for action. *śrīṇi* again must stand for *śrī*, while *śrīṇi* could be symbolized by Tumburu in the centre of the pantheon.

Furthermore the inconsistency in the iconographical description of Tumburu mentioned by GOUDRIAAN⁷⁴, namely the anomalous five-headed Tumburu in the *Netraṇṭra* (11.3), can be explained – on a theoretical level – with Abhinavagupta's theory of Tumburu being the fifth in the middle of four powers, but being subdued by them.

verses 288cd–289ab

We have seen above that the transition from one face to the other is nowhere clearly indicated in the text; there might be an intention behind this apparent lack of structure, namely to suggest that the five faces of Śiva form a single indivisible process: the five powers are a dynamic whole, which is differentiated only through shifting preponderance. From this perspective the present verse can be interpreted as describing two aspects of the nature of Śiva: his nature as *Vāma*, i.e. as connected to four powers, as well as *Aghora*, whose nature is to obliterate prior differentiation and who therefore does not really allow a "count-

⁷³ See TAY 3.13cd.

⁷⁴ GOUDRIAAN (1985), p. 53.

ing" of these powers. Formally the verse is a connecting verse typical for our author.⁷⁵

6.11 Aghora

It has been mentioned above that the sequence in which the five faces are introduced starts with those that play only subordinate roles in the Trika; ending the sequence with Aghora emphasizes the segment of the canon that deals with Bhairava and is therefore nearest to the Trika.

In the following account of the southern face, Abhinavagupta argues as follows: since Aghora is related to the non-dualistic Śāstras, the power that manifests this face, i.e. the power of action, is interpreted as that which nullifies prior division, thereby conforming to his description of non-duality as a rejection of duality. The aspect of resorption inherent in this concept accounts for the destructive practices prevalent in this part of the tradition,⁷⁶ but its fundamental structure, namely the "uprooting of duality" shows also that it is superior to the others.

We might add another thought: the doctrine of unification through action that our author expounds in the sequel can also serve to explain the working of ritual action. Unlike the Siddhānta the Trika has the problem that in order to explain how initiation can produce the liberating unification with Śiva, it has to reinterpret action as producing or embodying knowledge. But if the power of action necessarily leads to unity, ritual action too, besides expressing the underlying unity of the factors of action, will lead to this unity.⁷⁷

verses 289cd–292ab

The qualification "carefully" (*sādaram*) indicates that we are not dealing with outright destruction, but as with a controlled fusion.

verses 292cd–294ab

The "subtlest power" is *utā*, *paravadhan*, lit. "in the highest limit". The transmitted reading *paravadhan* is meaningless.

The description of *kriyā* evokes the image of a ferocious enacrated godde

that is eager to devour the offerings made by the devotees and becomes full in the process.⁷⁸

6.11.1 Unification Through Action

verse 294cd

The question prompts a discussion on action (1–308ab) and its agent (408cd–446ab); the main thread is taken up only in 347, where Aghora is identified with the *kriyāśakti*. Abhinava's position that the power of action corresponds to the non-duality inherent in the Bhairava scriptures of the southern stream – indicated subtly in 289cd – is now restated and defended.

verses 295–300ab

The author counters by adducing a grammatical parallel,⁷⁹ namely the status of actions as expressed in verbs. There is a discussion of this in Kaundinyabhatta's *Kāvīkaraṇabhīṣaśāstra*:

"With this in mind it is stated in the Vākyapadīya – see there – that 'the activity (*bhāva* = *kriyā*) described with verbal endings is non-existent'. And this activity [cooking by default] is said to be diverse in form: blowing [the fire], heating [the pot] from below and effort. For it is proven by experience that the knowledge of those diverse [activities] is [understood] from the sense of, for instance, the verb 'to cook'. And this [manifoldness] does not entail a multiplicity of meaning."⁸⁰

This proves for our author that not only in language, but also in reality, action has the power to unite objects. But in 296cd–297ab he wishes to go further by saying that this fact of daily experience and of grammar is only explicable if we assume a single reality of which these constituents are interdependent parts. The problem posed by objects with different matres becoming one through action therefore cannot occur; action only makes manifest the underlying unity. In 297cd–298ab the opponent introduces the view that "cooking" is just the name

⁷⁵ Cf. the quotation in *Pratyabhijñāhṛdaya* 8.

⁷⁶ For grammar being the model of many philosophic argumentations in the *Pratyabhijñā*, cf. TORELLA (1987).

⁸⁰ *etad evādāto 'austrabdhāto bhavati sa tīrpadat abhūdhivāte in vākyapadīyam in dharmasam evam ca evāparat phalakaravādhāsamidpanetrasatnaravādhānārupena vākyā paravādhādan tannāprakaravādhāsamidpanetrasatnaravādhānārupena tannāprat, vākyapadīyamānāpāra, p. 2.*

of disparate actions, but their convergence in a single path.
 For the same reason" refers to 297ab.

297cd-301ab
 The opponent disagrees with the theory of unification through action, etc.,
 as a single example of perception, in which different causes are involved in
 one during the process.

301cd-304ab
 The opponent emphatically rejects this view and shows the inconsistency in
 the argumentation: in order to explain action we cannot be assured of
 a difference between, for instance, the faculty of sight, the lamp and the
 potter. This is ultimately unreal. If they were separate entities, no single
 cause could come from their cooperation.

304d-308ab
 This section concludes the discussion of the power of action.

6.11.2 The Agent

308cd-309ab
 The opponent raises a question on the concept of the *limited agent*
 in relation to the universal agent Śiva: Even if we accept the
 fact that action unifies objects and thereby destroys division, it is not
 the agent, i.e. consciousness identified with a body, relates to the
 process.

309cd-310ab
 The opponent's phrase "I have moved what seemed to be the conclusion"
 is evidently self-contradictory and therefore rejected.

310cd-311ab
 The opponent's phrase "I have moved what seemed to be the conclusion"
 is evidently self-contradictory and therefore rejected.

series 311cd-312
 The opponent's phrase "I have moved what seemed to be the conclusion"
 is evidently self-contradictory and therefore rejected.
 As the sequence of the opponent's argument I have moved what seemed to be the conclusion
 to the end. One might find a difficulty in the text as transmitted, namely the
 position of *nama* as the subject of a line, but after a first line of objection, can
 thereby also be found in the text.
 It is only the identity of the agent with Śiva that is effective in causation,
 and it is only the identity of the agent with Śiva that is effective in causation.
 The opponent now reverses the argument and says that the difference of the potter with Śiva, then
 the potter would participate in universal causation and would in a sense also be
 the agent in the process of causation, and therefore everything else, as Śiva
 is the cause for everything.

series 313
 After this preparatory argument, follows a serious objection: The law of *karma*,
 i.e. the future effect of action in their agent, would be rendered invalid by this
 theory.

series 314-315
 This describes the concept of *karma* and at the same time immunizes
 his position against the objection: there is in fact no result of past actions, but
 only for those who have faith in it. In other words, objections are useless, be-
 cause those who do not understand this theory are indeed bound by *karma*.
 This is a side-sweep against the Sādhānīka, who maintains that in order to
 be finally liberated at death, the initiate has persevere in his daily observance
 in order to nullify the *karma* that is incessantly building up.¹² His life after im-
 mersion is seen merely as the rest of his *prārabdhakarma*, which continues like
 a potter's wheel, but is destined to come to an end.¹³

The dialectic Śiva Siddhānta explains the unliberated state with the concept
 of *mala* – an impurity conceived as a substance that has to be removed by im-
 mersion in the ocean of *mudra* and its products, whereas Abhinavagupta's interpretation
 of *mala* is based on MVT 1.23d which defines *mala* as ignorance.¹⁴ Accord-

¹² See the *Śaiva Siddhānta* as an example for the concept of *karma* in the *Śaiva Siddhānta*.
¹³ See the *Śaiva Siddhānta* as an example for the concept of *karma* in the *Śaiva Siddhānta*.
¹⁴ See the *Śaiva Siddhānta* as an example for the concept of *karma* in the *Śaiva Siddhānta*.

to the school this "impurity" (*mala*) falls into three parts, *ānava* - *karma* - *mayi* *mula*, which means that both *māyā* and *karma* are reinterpreted as a form of ignorance.

verses 316-318*ab*

Abhinavagupta here describes and refutes the theory of an inactive, merely experiencing consciousness whose "agentship" is only apparent. For our *anāva* this would contradict the nature of consciousness, but the opponent steps in by adducing the Sāṅkhya doctrine of an active *prakṛti* that binds the inactive soul. I understand this as a philosophical pattern introduced by a Śaiddhāntika who, when talking of *prakṛti*, means *māyā*, which in his dualistic system is different from Śiva.

verses 318*d*-320

By rendering *vythā* not adverbially ("wrongly"), but rather freely as "nonsense", the translation intends to capture the cumulative effect of the intensive *parigṛāte* "to assert obstinately"), *vythā* ("wrongly") and the derogatory description of those who adhere to this doctrine as misguided. The force of *grhe* is not clear to me (perhaps "privately"?).

In TĀ 10.46-50 Abhinavagupta allows a metaphorical interpretation only if there is a real entity or quality to which the metaphor refers.

verse 321

I suppose that *parigṛāte* implies "taught in the Śāstra".

verse 322

As far as I can see the verse only makes sense if we understand *prayojana* in the sense of *prayoga*.

verse 323

The second line is possibly corrupt, at least not understood by the present author. In the first pāda the transmitted text is unmetrical; without an intelligible second half the conjecture is of course extremely tentative.

verses 324-325

Here the opponent, or a disciple, offers a solution for the dilemma of an active I thought to be identical with an inactive God.

verse 326

This verse might be directed to his young students, but could also be just the usual insult of the *pārvapukṣa*.

verses 327-329

In other words, a differentiation in these three qualities is not sufficient to account for individual agentship, because these three qualities always coexist as potentials.

In translating this set of question and answer (328-329), I took *namu* as an indicator for the question; but 328 could also be the objection, weakly indicated by *kṛp*, and 329 the answer. 329 would then run smoothly into the next verse, but leave *namu* as introducing the answer - which is very unlikely.

verses 330-334

Abhinavagupta now reduces activity to a quality of knowledge pertaining to God. The conjecture in 332*b* is only an attempt to get some sense into these difficult verses.

verses 335-338

This is a short discussion of various theories which are then rejected. In 338, for instance, the possibility that the self is the agent not by virtue of its own activity, but by manifesting universal agentship through its qualities, is briefly mentioned.

verses 339-340*ab*

This, however, would conflict with the theory of liberation. If the presence of those qualities alone would be sufficient to experience the result of actions, then - given the pervasiveness of the selves - a liberation from *karma* is not possible, as their presence in other selves would be enough for a reappearance of *karma*.

verses 340*d*-342*ab*

From here on follows the author's conclusion. If God is the ultimate cause for every part of a complex process that seems to have its own causes, nothing remains to be done for the individual agent.

verses 342*d*-344*ab*

The universal causation by God extends even to the minute details. This conclusion, derived from the Pratyabhijñā doctrine of manifestation and of God's

...tute autonomy, leaves nothing to do for the individual. 343*cd* could also be read as another attack on the Siddhānta concept of indirect causation through Ananta.

verse 344*cd*–345*ab*

It is of course impossible to say whether the Śāradā manuscripts used for the K₁ actually read the *avagraha* in 344*d*, but 'bhede' would not serve the argument. This settles the question on *karma* that was raised in 313. There is no individual soul that could independently of God create *karma* or be influenced by it.

verse 346*d*–347

The author finally takes up the main thread of argumentation by identifying the power of action with the southern face (Aghora).

The *parā* in 347*b* could also mean that the *kriyāsakti* or the Aghora face is identified with the *parāśakti*.⁸⁵

verse 448

Here the fact that Aghora is directed to the South is "explained" with the second meaning of the word *dakṣiṇa*. The second line is not clear to me.

verse 349

The opponent, probably accepting the previous argumentation, wonders whether anything can ever become an agent. But for Abhinavagupta, who seems to understand *bhuvāḥ* as "beings" rather than just "things", this is the starting point for a description of the liberated state.

verse 350–352

In order to put the doctrines connected to this face into the right perspective the following passage has to show how this power of the southern face is responsible for liberation and is therefore appropriately called "non-terrifying" (*aghora*) and "kind" (*dakṣiṇa*).

verse 353–354*ab*

This is a quotation of MVT 3.33. There the powers of Śiva that are "not let

MVT the terrifying powers had been attributed to Parāparā and the "extremely terrifying" to Aparā.

verse 354*cd*–355*ab*

The quotation is of *Spandakārikā* 48, which is also quoted in TĀ 13.266. The idea is also used in Kṣemarāja's *Pratyabhijñāhṛdaya*, Sūtras 11 and 12.

For Abhinavagupta the emphasis must have been on 'jñāta' to which I have therefore in the translation subordinated the other attribute 'śūnārgasthā', – which, by the way, is omitted in the parallel (TĀ). For the different interpretations of the commentators on this verse, see DYCZKOWSKI (1992).

6.11.3 Phonematic Emanation

The power Parā mentioned in 354 is not only one of the three powers of the Trika,⁸⁶ but also a name for the highest form of speech (*parā vāk*). In his attempt to associate the power of action, the goddess Parā and the highest level of speech, Abhinava now proceeds to give an account of the "great creation" (*mahācaryā*), i.e. the creation that starts with the Sanskrit alphabet.⁸⁷

verse 355*cd*–357*ab*

The transmitted reading is metrically faulty and an emendation to *krodhikṛtau* seems to be the only way out.

The first creation that appears when the power of action "opens up" is the Sanskrit alphabet in its normal order (*matrkā*).⁸⁸ i.e. from *a* to *ha*. This happens on the highest level of speech (*parā vāk*), where a differentiation of letters has not yet taken place and they therefore appear only in an abbreviated form. This indistinctness expresses itself on the phonetic level through the grammatical rule of contraction (*pratyahārauvāḥa*) according to which the combination of the first (*a*) and last letter (*ha*) of a series encompasses all that lies in between. The lack of differentiation in this contraction is expressed by the *bindu*, the dot that represents the *anuvāra* and is interpreted as the undifferentiated reality. "By resting in the *bindu*" the first articulation or awareness of sound is that of T (*a-he* [t]).

⁸⁵ See SANDERSON (1990b).

⁸⁶ See PADoux (1990), Chapter 5: Phonematic Emanation, and especially p. 306ff.

⁸⁷ See TĀ 15.115cd–120c for the ritual placement of this series of letters onto the body.

⁸⁸ *matrkā*.

verses 357cd–365ab

In this passage the importance of the Śāstras created from this face is emphasized through the complexity of its description. One might consider to emend *bhava* in 362a to *abhāva* in order to add a fourth state of absence of both fullness and emptiness. *vimūcāra* in 364d is translated as “transcendence” according to a definition given in TĀ 15.278, where the practitioner is enjoined to perform the ritual with the impure left hand, “as it goes against *saṃsāra*” (*saṃsāravānāśāntarān*), which is explained by Jayaratha: “The [practice with the left hand] is opposed to the world of transmigration, excluded by the world and therefore a secret practice conducive to liberation.”⁸⁹ The point of *saṃkalpasatyabhāva* in 364ab is not clear to me.

verses 365cd–366ab

My restoration of the verse with three conjectures can only be called tentative, but *e* and *o* in Śāradā are easily confused and the *tra* in *trasta* can be explained as dittography. The verse asserts that the religious practice based on this phonetic emanation inherits the main quality of the *kṛtyāśakti* described above: its power to overcome duality.

verses 366cd–368ab

This “great creation” (*mahāśṛṣṭi*)⁹⁰ is not on the same spatial and temporal level on which all processes of creation and resorption are supposed to take place. To interpret it only as the first creation, i.e. one preceding “normal” *śṛṣṭi*, is thus not correct.

verses 368cd–370ab

The correlation of Aghora with the *kāraṇaśvara* Brahṃā, which – as we have said above – is anomalous, concludes the description of the five faces as identified with the five powers and the five *kāraṇaśvaras*. The series starting with Īśana/Sadaśiva and ending with Aghora/Brahṃā is the following.⁹¹

<i>vaikṛta</i>	<i>kāraṇa</i>	<i>śakti</i>
īśana	sadaśiva	jñāna

taṭparusa	īśvara	cid
sadyojāta	radra	icchā
vāmaṭeva	viṣṇu	ananda
aghora	brahmā	kriyā

verses 370cd–373

See 80 for the quotation from his own *Bodhopaiṇcadasikā*.

⁸⁹ *saṃkṣepa-saṃsāra-viparīta-kakabhiṣṭa-mukhyaṃ-guṇa-rūpasya ācārah*.

⁹⁰ See PAULSEN (1980), p. 304ff.

⁹¹ See the tables in the introduction and 252.

Section 7
The Three Divisions of the Śāstra

372–375ab
The following section, which concludes the first chapter of the *Vārtika* on the *pañcasmṛtas* (i.e. 15–399), has been excerpted by Jayaratha in his commentary on TĀ 1.18.¹

The editors of the Kēd of the *Vārtika* supply a short explanation that is based on Jayaratha with 374.

What follows is a description of how the divisions of the Śaiva canon come about on the lowest level of speech, where we can finally talk about texts; even if they are still taught by deities to other deities and not yet “brought down to earth” by *avatāra*kas. The first group of texts is the so-called Śiva division, ten texts which are attributed to specific combinations of the five faces: (1) Īśāna emerged, (2) Īśāna emerging, (3–6) Tatpuruṣa and Sadyojāta emerged and emerging, (7) the three together, (8) Īśāna and Tatpuruṣa, (9) Īśāna and Sadyojāta, (10) Sadyojāta and Tatpuruṣa.

This arrangement also explains why these three faces are excluded from consideration in the Trika (*saṅgadhāra*). As they stand exclusively for duality, their scope is too limited to be integrated fully into the non-dual schools.

verses 375cd–376ab
J’s reading in 376b (“in the division called Śiva”) is equally possible.

verses 376cd–377
As we have seen the three faces Īśāna, Tatpuruṣa and Sadyojāta represent dual. By the combination of these with the left and the right face therefore produce a group which is supposed to teach a doctrine that is intermediate between dualism and monism.

If we ignore the interpretation in TĀ 1.18 for the time being, we seem to have three groups of six. The most straightforward interpretation is to form groups of two by combining Vāmadeva and Aghora with the three faces mentioned before. The three groups can be formed, similar to the description of the *śivabheda*, by three states of emergence. I concede that *-adbhava*ih in 377b contradicts this interpretation, but I cannot see another way of forming three groups of six. Instead of resorting to more complicated interpretations one might consider emending boldly *-adbhava*ih to *-bhūtaka*ih.

The problem with this verse is that it cannot be brought in line with the description that Jayaratha gives of the *rudrabheda*, a description that is presumably based on the *Pārvapāñjika*. I do not think that there is a problem of consistency: our author, for instance, describes the stages of *āraṇḍa* differently in the TĀ and the second Kāṇḍa of the MVV without losing a word on the discrepancy. But if the assumption that the *Pārvapāñjika* was an earlier work that was partly superseded by the *Vārtika* is correct, then the fact that Jayaratha’s explanation is based only on the earlier source is noteworthy.

verse 378
Jayaratha’s testimony gives interesting readings, but in this case, where it is likely that they stem from another text that might have had a slightly different version of the same verse (i.e. the *Pārvapāñjika*), conflation should be avoided. Cf. SANDERSON (1990b), 12.34–39, for the idea.

verse 379
I doubt that the transmitted reading *nāpānaniktatā* (“nothing that has not been said before”) in 379d can be made to yield sense in this context. Jayaratha states in a slightly different context that there is *no* repetition in the combination of faces, and I cannot see what our author should have meant by the opposite.

verses 380–382
I have taken the repetition in *anyānya* (380a) as indicative of a distributive sense, rather than in the normal sense of “mutually” etc.

The passage emphasizes that the whole Śaiva Śāstra is valid, i.e. leads to true liberation. But as we have seen in 194cd–195ab there are differences as to whether this is accomplished directly, that is during one’s lifetime, or gradually and slowly through further stages. For 380d compare the passage quoted in TĀV 13.303: *yataḥ śivadbhavaḥ sarve śivadhīnaphalapradāḥ*.

The position of this affirmation immediately after the Śiva- and the Rudradivision is intentional: the scriptures that follow, i.e. those associated with

ritual reality which finally culminates in the Aghora face, furthermore the creation of concrete scriptures from those five faces, and the three-fold classification of those scriptures. The Trika, according to the preceding descriptions, is more or less a special combination of the Aghora, the Vāma and the highest (*ūrdhvaṇḍhva*) face. But this is not enough for Abhinavagupta. For him the Trika subsumes even the Siddhānta, and this forms the topic of the few verses that conclude this chapter. The threefold division of the Śāstra into Śiva, Rudra and Bhairava, i.e. the state in which the utmost diversification of doctrine takes place, suddenly reduces the pentad to an underlying trinity. In other words, even on this comparatively external level the reality is that of the Trika rather than the Siddhānta. It is then only logical that the Trika cannot remain higher than and in antagonism to the Siddhānta, it must incorporate it as a lower level.

verses 393–394ab

This connects with verses 50 and 20ed by alluding to the equilibrium of these three powers in the highest stream. There are other ways to understand *vidyā*, but the most likely interpretation is that the pentad of the Siddhānta is only an extension of the Trika, whereas the latter remains a scripture of greater essentiality for the specially qualified.

verses 394cd–395ab

As we have seen in 160 the Trika was conceived of as a combination of three streams out of six, namely the “uppermost” (*ūrdhvaṇḍhva*), the Vāma and the Dakṣiṇa. Here the fusion of the three results in the Kaula that has absorbed the characteristics of the “left” and the “right”: “The essence of all the Tantras [i.e. the uppermost], when resting on the left and the right and fusing into one, becomes the Kaula [level] in the Trika.”⁶ There is also evidence that this is a description of “ritual reality”.⁷

verses 395–397

The reading of TĀV 1.18 is exceptionally accepted in 396ef because it avoids the redundancy of *trayamūl-īritayam*.

The verse is a description, not of the basic structure of the Trika as *padanḍa* of the deity Trisirobbhairava, which obviously encompasses not only the left and right stream, but also Kāla! We can only speculate on the background of

this doctrine, possibly it is meant to account for peculiarities in the worship of Trisirobbhairava in the lost Tantra of the same name.⁸ Jayaratha notes that the Trisirobbhairava is a *summitāntara* (TĀV 4.251), which can only mean that it is on a lower level of the Trika, a level which accommodates even the Siddhānta? Was the deity Trisirobbhairava worshipped with the three heads Īśana, Tumburu and Aghora?

Apart from the reason mentioned above, the reading accepted from TĀV 1.18 contains a more plausible attribution of powers. For *aparā*, which symbolizes duality, should stand for Īśana and Parā for Aghora (*dakṣa*), not vice versa.

verse 398

This verse is the conclusion drawn from 396. If Bhairava, i.e. the Kaula deity, encompasses the three powers that correlate to *ūrdhva*/Īśana, Vāma and Dakṣiṇa, then those scriptures are rooted in the Kaula stream and eventually lead to the goal as defined in this essential Śaivism, namely the freedom from duality and contraction.

The details of interpretation are however less straightforward: judging from the context *kula* is used here as scripture of the Kula. As Tantras and Kulas are mentioned, it can only mean that Tantras denote lower scriptures and Kula “higher” ones, but it is not clear whether “Tantras” means only the Siddhānta scriptures, or includes those of the Vāma and Dakṣiṇa stream. Judging from the use of the word in one passage of the *Jayadrathavāṇīta*,⁹ the latter seems more probable. For the use of the word, compare also *Śrīkaṇṭhī* (prose passage following on verse 5).

verse 399

The first chapter of the *Vārtika* ends here with the quotation of the word *jñānacandra* from MVT 1.1., thereby implying that the preceding chapter was an explanation of the implied meaning of these two words.¹⁰

⁸ It appears from Kṣemarāja's commentary on *Śrīacchandaśāstra* 2.25 and his commentary on *Śrītantra* 10.1–10ab that the *Trisirobbhairava* tantra belonged to the *dakṣiṇamūl*.

⁹ *ūrdhva*/*aparāntarā* ve *akṣaṇa* *kūṭa* ye *saṃraṅgaṇḍī* ye *prokṣa* *advaitadṛṣṭyaśuśrūṣa* ab.

¹⁰ Cited in SANDERSON (1997).

¹¹ C. TA 13.348 *trīṣṭambavipulanacandra*.

¹² *trīṣṭambavipulanacandra* *śāstra* *mūlāṇa* *kūṭa* *śrītantra* *śāstra*.

¹³ *trīṣṭambavipulanacandra* *śāstra* *mūlāṇa* *kūṭa* *śrītantra* *śāstra*.

¹⁴ *trīṣṭambavipulanacandra* *śāstra* *mūlāṇa* *kūṭa* *śrītantra* *śāstra*.

¹⁵ *trīṣṭambavipulanacandra* *śāstra* *mūlāṇa* *kūṭa* *śrītantra* *śāstra*.



Appendix I The Śrīkaṇṭhī

The following appendix is a transcript¹ of the singular fragment of this important text which was discovered by Prof. SANDERSON in the *Nīrāḍisaṃgraha* [abhidhānapaddhati].² In the Paddhati the text is called *Śrīkaṇṭhī*. Kṣemara-ja uses the same name,³ but also *Śrīkaṇṭhasaṃhitā*⁴ and *Śrīkaṇṭhiyasaṃhitā*.⁵

For several reasons I have not tried to edit the text; most of the names of Tantras in the many lists cannot be verified easily, and the characterization of scriptures are, without access to the texts that are described, difficult to follow. Even the emendation of corrupt passages is on insecure grounds, because there are more original "aīsa"-forms⁶ than in some of the parallels. In other words, if one focusses on the text of the *Śrīkaṇṭhī* itself, there is the dilemma that, in order to understand the text, parallels are needed that are more "correct", but the more correct may still be secondary.

Before an edition can be attempted it is therefore necessary to compare the lists with parallels. For the list of the twenty-eight Siddhānta-Tantras this has been done by GOODALL (1995), and for the sixty-four by SANDERSON (forthcoming).

For the present purpose, that is, to understand the possible influence of the *Śrīkaṇṭhī* on Abhinavagupta's philosophy, a transcript and a table of contents will nevertheless be instructive, even if the text remains partly unintelligible. Although I have not been able to trace a direct quotation from this text by

¹ This appendix is based on the results of a reading group in Śaiva manuscripts formed by Dominic Goodall, Harunaga Isaacson, James Mallinson, Judith Torzok and the present author, during which a transcript of the first 150 verses of this text was prepared.

² The manuscript is Ms. Stein Or. d. 43, Bodleian Library, Oxford.

³ *Śrīkaṇṭhasaṃhitā* 84: *Śrīkaṇṭhasaṃhitā* 10.3-5.

⁴ *Śrīkaṇṭhasaṃhitā* 84: *Śrīkaṇṭhasaṃhitā* 10.3-5.

⁵ *Śrīkaṇṭhasaṃhitā* 84: *Śrīkaṇṭhasaṃhitā* 10.3-5.

⁶ There is undoubtedly original hiatus, secondary sandhi ("y eka" 8c), wrong gender ("the dāt" 154a, 327a/c) etc.

संक्षेपेण न विज्ञेयं यथाक्रममुपदिश्यते ।

अदृष्टविग्रहाच्छान्तिच्छिवात्परमकारणात् ।
ज्ञानस्य विनिष्कान्तमनवच्छेदनं महत् ॥ १ ॥

कारणत्वं यदा शान्तं मोक्षेति अनाहृतम् ।
श्रुते यत्परं यस्मादक्षरस्येन कीर्तितः ॥ २ ॥

यो सावचित्त्य इत्याहुः प्राणिनां प्राणधारकः ।
चिदात्मा स्वर्गः स्वस्थः स्वसर्वो निराश्रयः ॥ ३ ॥

तन्मनुष्या हृदयाब्जस्थो वदते नादरूपकः ।
आर्गोपालाङ्गना वाला खेच्छाः प्राकृतभाषिणः ॥ ४ ॥
जनचराश्च ये सत्त्वाग्ने ऽपि नित्यं ब्रुवन्ति तम् ।

नादस्य ह्वात् न ह्रस्व इति सूत्रे ।
तदुत्पत्तिमिदं सर्वं सत्त्वोक्तप्रदम् ॥ ५ ॥

अथातो वेदव्याकरणतर्कोनाहमप्युपवेशवशैवसौख्यद्वैतं साध्यसाधनद्वयं
कृत्स्नोनासाकुलाभ्यपि

एवमादिकभेदेभ्यु शब्दब्रह्म प्रतिष्ठितम् ।
तथाम्येवंशुभिः शुभेनामभेदेनैकजः ॥ ६ ॥

एतं भेदाः सप्तदश मुख्यान्वे कीर्तिता मया ।
तेषां भेदं प्रवक्ष्यामि शृद्धविद्यागमोद्भवम् ॥ ७ ॥

अनन्तसूत्रनिर्यातमागमोदितवत्त्वेना ।
वदति प्रथमं यच्च तच्चतुर्धा प्रकीर्तितम् ॥ ८ ॥

अथैवः पृथिवी ब्रह्मा आपो विष्णुर्देवः स्मृतः ।
सदृशजो भवेत्सामं वाय्वीशो ऽथर्व उच्यते ॥ ९ ॥

अध्यायानां महर्षेण कृता नक्षेत्रनेकजः ।
असंख्यैः शास्त्रसामान्यैर्वैदुमन्त्रादिपुग्निः ॥ १० ॥

पञ्चविद्यामहर्षेण साङ्गोपाङ्गादियमृतः ।
नवसाधनवर्जुणं कथयदमवतारिणम् ॥ ११ ॥

तत्रैव व्याकृतं शास्त्रं कान्तान्तर्निमित्ततः ।
अथर्वे वक्षिणं वक्तुं गुरुमन्त्रालयं श्रमम् ॥ १२ ॥

आयुर्वेदं पूर्ववक्तुं न शब्दब्रह्मप्रवर्तकम् ।
स्मार्तं सर्वोद्भूतमृणं कृत्याभ्यादियमृतम् ॥ १३ ॥

पश्चिमं साममिन्दुकं च्छन्दाध्ययनभूषितम् ।
ह्वात् ह्रस्व च ह्रीति ह्यायति गीयते ॥ १४ ॥

यत्तुल्यसमवक्तुं तच्चतुर्धा न पठ्यते ।
अक्षर उकारश्च मकारश्चाधेमात्रकः ॥ १५ ॥

शैवेयिकाद्यादीश्वर्याधप्रतिपत्तयः ।
प्रपञ्चनमिमिन्तं च धातुशब्दानुशासनम् ॥ १६ ॥

व्याकरोति यदा सर्वं तदा व्याकरणं स्मृतम् ।
तथा तच्च विज्ञेयं कालान्तर्निमित्ततः ॥ १७ ॥

गुरुमानवशाकान्यगार्थयान्यकृतं तथा ।
कान्ययनभेदाजगृह्येयकृतानि च ॥ १८ ॥
नव व्याकरणाभ्येव सर्वशब्दाधकारणम् ।

एत्यादिप्रमाणधरमाणं चाष्टधा यथा ॥ १९ ॥
शास्त्रवाचकसम्बन्धमनुसंधादिनक्षत्रम् ।
विज्ञाद्विज्ञानि सामान्यं धर्मादनिर्धेनात् स यः ॥ २० ॥
इष्टा दृष्टा तसोऽप्यं तन्मि जनयिता यथा ।
शुक्लकोदिसनकोनमिसा निरुक्तः ॥ २१ ॥

अन्तःकरण त्रित्वेति कर्मेवुद्धीन्द्रिया दश ।
प्रकृतिस्त्रिगुणा देवि पुरुषः पञ्चविंशकः ॥ ८५ ॥

म च कर्तन्ति भाकेति संयोगात्फलमश्रुते ।
निष्पत्तिः पदसन्धेति अयस्कान्तो मणिर्यथा ॥ ८६ ॥

स्फटिकः सूर्यतेजोऽन तद्ब्रह्मविनिश्चयः ।
विपर्ययाद्गुणानां तु पृथग्भाक्त्वकमन्तः ॥ ४७ ॥

बहुस्तत्त्वान्प्रसिद्धाश्च इति मानप्रमातृतः ।
अयमः समग्रे नित्य प्रकृतिस्थो न मुच्यते ॥ ६८ ॥

प्रधानपुरुषान्तरं दृष्ट्वा प्रकृतिकेवलः ।
अकतां भाग्यनिष्पत्तां लोष्टवदनुकेवलः ॥ ४९ ॥

मन्तः साख्यविदामेव प्राकृतं मतमुच्यते ।
पुरुषान्न परं किञ्चित्सा काष्ठा सा परा गतिः ॥ ५० ॥

यदेतत्सम्यग्ज्ञानं त्रिप्रमाणमुदाहृतम् ।
जनकोटिप्रविस्तीर्णं पाञ्चगव्यं प्रमाणतः ॥ ५१ ॥

तत्र भेदज्ञं पूर्णं पांडशाधिकमेव च ।
विष्णुना कथितं देवि पञ्चकालनिर्देशनम् ॥ ५२ ॥

नामभेदेन वक्ष्यामि संहितानां समाप्तः ।
नागार्थी सङ्कषेणी प्रद्युम्ना चानिरुद्धिका ॥ ५३ ॥

वेदायसी च कपिला आत्रेयी कालपौष्करी ।
नारद्वार्ता च कान्नास्था ऐन्द्री वौधायनी तथा ॥ ४८ ॥

स्वभान्तरी तयक्सेना कुमांख्या शाङ्गपायिनी ।
नाम्दा कालकी नाक्ष्या प्रह्लादा पांशुर्ग तथा ॥ ५४ ॥

यथा ह्यर्थात्तं चैव तथा कान्तदर्पायका ।
रक्तद्रवा रक्तकान्त्या माया वैभवा तथा ॥ ४६ ॥

= १७^६M = उमति ms ५९ पुष्पात्र conj | पुष्पान् ms ५१० वाहय
५२ ३ ५९ वाहय conj | लयाँ ms

वामिष्ठा परमा मद्वा औवां मास्वर्ती तथा ।
मान्दजाना तथा लक्ष्म्या नरनागयणी तथा ॥ ५७ ॥

हैरण्यगर्भां पौलस्त्या अधामुवंदा नागदी ।
 त्रिस्तुभ्यश्च जाण्डल्या कौस्तुभाख्या च संहिता ॥ ५८ ॥

शेषानन्ता मात्वता च दाहंस्पत्याथ गालवा ।
मयाध्या संहिता देवि तथा काण्डपिण्डे च ॥ ५० ॥

मौमन्ता चापि विन्ता च तथा त्रैलोक्यमोहिनी
वत्स यवतारा च नागसैन्ही त्रिविक्रमा ॥ ६० ॥

द्वन्नाश्रयेया क्रियासागर मनस्वीमायिका तथा ।
लोमहर्षणिका चैव विहगेन्द्रमत तथा ॥ ६१ ॥

पागश्यां च कापिन्धी तथा मौषणकेतुका ।
रातुगत्र्या च वायव्या जैमीशव्या च माण्डवी ॥ ६२ ॥

माल्वा कालपरा चैव वैकुण्ठद्युतगौतमा ।
नारिकेता आमदग्नी वैशम्पायनिका तथा ॥ ६३ ॥

श्रीपदी चैव शाकल्या गृह्यर्ग पाधिर्वीतथा ।
क्षीतशर्मा ध्रुवान्ता च महामान्दाग्निमानवी ॥ ६८ ॥

न्यात्मिकाप्याङ्गिर्मा आरुणा शकटायनी ।
अध्याप्यादिवाग्ही तथा प्रद्युम्भकामिका ॥ ६५ ॥

ब्रह्मोद्वा नृ किन्नल्का तेषांस्त्रवणिका नथा ।
कण्टकग मन्थभासा माकाण्डेया भवोद्वा ॥ ६६ ॥

गुह्यार्णवा म्कोटसिंहं तथा पातालकमग्निम् ।
मुनिभासा पद्ममुनिनिरुक्ता विश्वसम्भवा ॥ ६७ ॥

61c सामर्थ्यिका conj. मोक्षमर्थिका ms. 61d विहगन्द conj. विहगन्द ms.

अनधारा विश्वमूर्त्ता विश्वस्येना अनुष्ठिता ।
दशावतारा प्रणवा पदगर्भा तु त्वामशा ॥ ६८ ॥

सूरणां चैव दवशि अने के पाउशाधिकम् ।
सहितानां वराग्राह वैष्णव परिकीर्तितम् ॥ ६९ ॥

प्रत्यक्षदिपरोक्षारिसामान्यमनलक्षणम् ।
उद्यागपरिणाम च न पुनर्ज्ञेयलक्षणम् ॥ ७० ॥

कर्मसम्बन्धितान्त्रिका भावशून्यमिदं जगत् ।
यद्गत् महत्त चेति त्रनदुद्बुदसम्भवम् ॥ ७१ ॥

कः कनो को ऽव क्रियते मन मानद्वनामिति ।
तीर्थादिन्येति ह्यस्य यङ्गताकाशा तमानुदः ॥ ७२ ॥

तज्ज्यानिष्ठानिलक्षण सौराणां मतमुत्तमम् ।
न्यानीरुपमिदं सर्वं जगत्स्थायरज्जुमम् ॥ ७३ ॥

वदुधा गीयते तच्च सौभेदादियम्भवम् ।
सद्भिवाधेति निष्पत्ति तत्त्ववक्ष्यामि साम्प्रतम् ॥ ७४ ॥

माताण्डो महिता पूर्व महामानाण्डिकी तथा ।
तृतीयो भगविवा च तथा भैरवशेखरी ॥ ७५ ॥

वदमन्त्रादिसङ्कीर्ता त्रैमिनीया च पद्ममी ।
महागान्ध्या तथा धर्मा भास्करा मनमी स्मृता ॥ ७६ ॥

पराय्या चाटमी प्राक्ता नवमी समयमा तथा ।
दशमी गृध्रचक्राष्टा महालक्ष्मी तथा परा ॥ ७७ ॥

महया द्वादशी प्राक्ता कृष्णा च त्रयोदशी ।
चण्डा च व्यासगर्भा च मशान्का ऽ स्करा ॥ ७८ ॥

शरद्री वेव कारण्या यमुना च तथाजिता ।
अथा मशजिम्बा नाम गजमचक्रा खगेश्वरी ॥ ७९ ॥

मशान्का च महोत्काख्या तमोत्का व्यासमालिनी ।
कान्तारा पुष्करावता तथा साम्प्राम्यसहित्ता ॥ ८० ॥

वैद्यनरी वकाशा च सवनोख्या च पिङ्गला ।
हनुमाख्या याशवल्की जानकी यशस्यन्ता ॥ ८१ ॥

उष्ट्रधवाख्याखरुषा कान्तवैद्यनरी यथा ।
वज्रवता महादेवा तथा व्याजीवनायिका ॥ ८२ ॥

तायिका तेजनि ऽ याक्षिका माद्रतायिका ।
जोषाको परमाको च प्रशान्ताको च वेद्युना ॥ ८३ ॥

धमेधरा प्रासाभो तन्त्रगर्भो हा ।
हृष्यगर्भो रुम्भुया तथाय्या हृरिमदिनी ॥ ८४ ॥

भवका ह्यात्मवेता च तथा पिङ्गलचनका ।
स्वभाश्रय्या गौड्या व्यासा च सारणा ॥ ८५ ॥

वेदनाख्या द्विगिरता सहिरा द्विविडा तथा ।
श्रीतां च सारतिपटा मेरुस्यन्ता तथाचिक्ती ॥ ८६ ॥

महाचेता तेजगर्भो महाकैरायिका तथा ।
सुखगर्भो व्यादशात्मा सुयधमांलरा तथा ॥ ८७ ॥

व्यासाङ्गाया व्यासगर्भो पद्माशीतिस्तु महिता ।
इत्येताः सहिता देवि मुख्यत्वे सौरभेवतः ॥ ८८ ॥

महातन्त्रभेदेन पादकेनावकनं च ।
व्याख्यन्ताभेदेन कथिताः पादभेदः ॥ ८९ ॥

प्रत्यक्षतन्त्रो नाम सौराणां तन्त्रमाणितः ।
सर्वगमिहितं यत्र अथे वङ्गारासाकुलम् ॥ ९० ॥

अत्यल्प महाधे च महिताधे च न विदः ।
तान्त्रिक यन्त्रमुत्तमं स्मृत्या सत्परिकीर्त्यते ॥ ९१ ॥

१०. महाभक्ता ८०॥१॥ महाभक्ता ८०॥

मक्षमावादीपानं च पदान् तान् भदितम् ।
भ्रातृन्तमर्षीवन्तान् अयादादविनिर्णयम् ॥ १० ॥

भगोपुत्रे तु ग दवि ग्रन्थः प्रतिपाद्यते ।
पुत्रावन्तुपुत्रद्वयं यदुग्रन्थाभेयकुलम् ॥ १३ ॥

आनुपुत्र्येण या दादः स परिच्छेदपुत्रकः ।
पुत्रविषयद्वयं जीवा ये हयापादेयलक्षणः ॥ १४ ॥

मायाणुकीमिका कन्धादिद्विधापुत्रकः ।
भार्यान्मुख्ययतिन्याद्देराग्यप्रतिपत्तयः ॥ १५ ॥

विज्ञातः परम् तन्त्रं शक्तिपातस्य लक्षणम् ।
दानक्षपणहत्यादिमुक्षमदेहविनाशनम् ॥ १६ ॥

मन्त्रं यन्परं ज्ञानं पदं प्राप्नोति निश्चितम् ।
प्रसादाच्च न यन्मन्त्रं सिद्धान्तं समुदाहृतम् ॥ १७ ॥

निर्वाहितवन्त्रपाणि भावानि परमाधेनः ।
तन्मयः प्राप्तिमयागः स शाक्तः परिकीर्तितः ॥ १८ ॥

कान् शर्मा र्गमित्याहुर्नोश्चिं विद्यते क्वचित् ।
स्वभावफलनिर्वातिर्नान्यत्परन्तु पुनः ॥ १९ ॥

विषदादि यजुर्धोन्नतस्थितं तत्कृतं स्मृतम् ।
द्विगुणार्थिभिः यन् तत्तत्पुं व्ययस्थितम् ॥ २० ॥

गहसन्धप्रकाशादि यवेसहारन्लक्षणम् ।
कीदार्थमिति नदयि सद्यःप्रत्ययकारकम् ॥ २१ ॥

अधुना दशधा येन श्रेयार्थः परिकीर्त्यते ।
दशाष्टादशभेदेन गृहभवादिवलक्षणम् ॥ २२ ॥

कालसन्धप्रशक्तिपा नदः शब्दादियम्भयः ।
मध्यन्दिन कालिना दवि किञ्चिच्छब्दान्तरान्तरः ॥ २३ ॥

यः कल्पयति सः ॥ २४ ॥
यः कल्पयति सः ॥ २५ ॥

विज्ञानः शब्दद्वयं सर्वविद्यात्मकः स्मृतः ।
तन्निर्वाहिकः ज्ञानं तन्मयं वदन्तिनाम ॥ २०४ ॥

इति नृदा विद्यात्मजस्योपनिषत्तन्त्रः ।
विद्यात्मिनां तु मन्त्राश्च नृदाविद्याम् ॥ २०५ ॥

अनुपुत्र्येण पुत्रेण व्यापित्वं मन्त्रव्यभिक्ताः ।
अथ दत्तान्तरस्य पञ्चमन्त्रमयस्य च ॥ २०६ ॥

दत्तानामि ज्ञानानि शास्त्रान्तरनिमित्तानि ।
रुद्रैः पुत्रैः प्राच्या याम्य उत्तरतः क्रमान् ॥ २०७ ॥

मन्त्रस्यैव भवेज्ज्ञानं शिवस्यैव ज्ञानं ।
तन्मिह योगजं चिन्मयं साकृदमभ्यस्यन्तु ॥ २०८ ॥

शिवं मन्त्रं तु साहचर्यमात्रतान्त्रिकं तथा ।
शिवमयाः समाख्याता रुद्रभद्राणां द्विभेदः ॥ २०९ ॥

शिवं परमेशं च विद्याशास्त्रोक्तम् च ।
मन्त्रस्यैव चिन्मयं साकृदमभ्यस्यन्तु ॥ २१० ॥

चन्द्राङ्गं वीरभद्रं च आनय च मन्त्रस्यैव ।
शिवं मन्त्रस्यैव चिन्मयं साकृदमभ्यस्यन्तु ॥ २११ ॥

मन्त्रं मन्त्रस्यैव चिन्मयं साकृदमभ्यस्यन्तु ।
शिवं मन्त्रस्यैव चिन्मयं साकृदमभ्यस्यन्तु ॥ २१२ ॥

शिवं मन्त्रस्यैव चिन्मयं साकृदमभ्यस्यन्तु ।
शिवं मन्त्रस्यैव चिन्मयं साकृदमभ्यस्यन्तु ॥ २१३ ॥

१०५. साकृदर्थः (TAV) conj. | यान्तिदाम्भवेत् ms. 108b शिवस्यैव ज्ञानं ।
विद्यात्मिनां विद्या (TAV) 108c शक्तिः । कामजं TAV 108d योगजं चिन्मयं
मन्त्रस्यैव conj. | यान्तिदाम्भवेत् ms. 109a रुद्रभद्राणां द्विभेदः । रुद्रभद्राणां द्विभेदः
TAV 110a योगजं च । येन विद्यात्मजं TAV 110b विद्याशास्त्रोक्तम् एव च conj. |
विद्यात्मिनां विद्या च ms. 111a योगजं चिन्मयं TAV 110d शक्तिः (TAV) conj. |
योगजं ms. 111b योगजं । योगजं TAV 111c योगजं च । योगजं च TAV
112a योगजं conj. | योगजं योगजं ms. 112c विद्यात्मिनां विद्या । विद्यात्मिनां विद्या TAV

बहुगन्धार्थभेदेष्ट तान्यवक्ष्यामि साम्प्रतम् ।
अष्टाविंशति यं भेदाः सा तनुः पार्थमेष्टरी ॥ ११६ ॥

शरीरं देवदेवस्य शब्दब्रह्मप्रतिष्ठितम् ।
अनुग्रहार्थं भूतानां नान्यथा कायसम्भवः ॥ ११७ ॥

मन्त्रमुक्तिः स भगवान्पादाख्यः परमेष्ठरः ।
शरीरं रुद्रभेदेऽन्तु शिवभेदेष्ट पार्वति ॥ ११६ ॥

सर्वमन्त्राः ॥ यत्के ऽपि यो ज्ञानानि स वेदवित् ।
शिरःप्रभृति पादानां तत्प्रवक्ष्यामि साम्प्रतम् ॥ ११७ ॥

सुध्रेऽन्तु विजयं ज्ञानं ललाटात्पार्थमेष्टरम् ।
नैवेद्यस्यैव निःश्वास ज्ञानगजमनुत्तमम् ॥ ११८ ॥

श्रवणाभ्यां च श्राद्धीतं मुखाद्यं मुखविम्बकम् ।
क्वन्ध्याः सिद्धसुत्रान्तु मनानं कक्षदेशतः ॥ ११९ ॥

वक्षसां नागसिद्धन्तु स्तनाभ्यां चन्द्रसंज्ञकम् ।
हृदयाद्द्वारभद्राख्यसागमेयं जठरोद्भवम् ॥ १२० ॥

स्वायम्भुव नाभिदेशात्पाञ्चभ्यां विमरं तथा ।
गैर्यव पृष्ठदेशान्तु विमल कटिदेशतः ॥ १२१ ॥

निष्ठात्किरणसूत्रं तु ललितं चौर्य्युत्तमः ।
ज्ञानभ्यां सौमभयन्तु शिवाग्रात्कामिकं तथा ॥ १२२ ॥

जिह्वायां योगजं चैव जिह्वायाश्चिन्त्यसूत्रकम् ।
माकुटं मुकुटान्ज्ञानं वाङ्मन्यमश्रुमान्ध्या ॥ १२३ ॥

नाचनचित्तपादौतं मुष्म कण्ठाद्विनिर्गतम् ।
दन्तेरत्र च मास्रश्च हृन्मयान्त्रितं तथा ॥ १२४ ॥

पादयान्नामाख्यं तन्त्रं तारागणादवम् ।
वा ऽख्यः परमरा भेदः शिवमन्त्रस्य पदार्थं ॥ १२४ ॥

मण्डः स तु विशेषः क्षुदिदेवगोपिगिरि ।

तद्दत्तामरक्षिणभेदावदौ मुध्रोपलक्षितौ व्याख्यास्यामः । तच्चैकादशभेदभिन्नसम्बन्ध-
निमित्तभेदमप्राप्तमात्रवक्तव्यं । पुर्वस्वरूपज्ञास्वाधेदशकां वक्तव्यः ।

वाच्यवाचकमन्त्रस्यभेदाद्विलक्षणम् ॥ १२६ ॥

वाच्यो ऽर्थो वाचकः शब्दः स चार्थो बहुधा भवेत् ।
मूर्ध्निमिन् समारम्भं वस्तुपुर्वमङ्गलम् ॥ १२७ ॥

प्रतिपत्त्यदिमामान्यं मनके आनुसंगिकम् ।
शब्दानां पुर्ववर्हेति तथा च बहुभेदनः ॥ १२८ ॥

बह्वेदेष्टाधिका वृद्धिः शक्तिकारजतभ्रमः ।
मातृश्रवत्प्रपत्यं ऽष्टा श्रुतीनामागतं तथा ॥ १२९ ॥

प्रवर्तते निराकाङ्क्षं बुद्धानि परिश्रयते ।
अन्यथावगातत्वाहं सर्वदेवेव भाव्यते ॥ १३० ॥

कृशादिनृक्षं देवि स शब्दो बहुभेदनः ।
अनुग्रहार्थं भूतानां निमित्तः परिगीयते ॥ १३१ ॥

मयावन्निमित्तार्थं तद्वन्ध्यान्मोचयेत्पशुन् ।
सर्वस्वादिशास्त्रस्य निमित्तः परिकीर्तितः ॥ १३३ ॥

यथा बहुविधो देवि बहुधातुन्धविस्मरतः ।
बुद्धिभेदं तु धीक्षणां शैवानां ईश्वरेति च ॥ १३४ ॥

मन्त्रभद्र मन्त्राधोना सौराणां ज्ञानसम्भवम् ।
मन्त्रिकृपाणां ऋभद्र वक्रम्भानामनकशः ॥ ११४ ॥

शक्तिभद्र विद्याभद्र मन्त्रभद्र च पश्यत ।
शब्दब्रह्मप्रभनत्याद्वाचवर्गशिवदत्तः ॥ १३६ ॥

भवतारप्रभटाश्च सत्ताभेदमुद्राङ्गितम् ।
पट्टप्रमाणाश्च पुरविकाः प्रत्यक्षाश्च ये स्थिताः ॥ १३५ ॥

स्वसबदनमन्त्रश्च तथा चानुभवः स्मृतः ।
प्रमाणशुद्धिश्च शैवि शैवेऽस्मिन्परिगीयते ॥ १३८ ॥

यानानुसारं वाक्यार्थं सन्देहविनिवृत्तये ।
इवतावद्भुवन्देन प्रवतारविभेदतः ॥ १३९ ॥

वक्ता यदभिसम्बन्धः सर्वशाम्बप्रवर्तकः ।
सकृपापुनरिना भुत्वा ससारविनिवृत्तये ॥ १८० ॥

किमिदं कृतं कामाच्च यानःसम्बन्धरक्षणम् ।
अप्यानादिसमुद्भूतं स्वच्छया नावतान्त्रिम ॥ १८१ ॥

शिवादनन्तनाथेन स्थानान्तरधुयागतम् ।
नन्मस्वान्त्रितं भुमाववतारशक्तिं च ॥ १८२ ॥

इत्यागतमाना सम्बन्धः क्रमायातन्त्रदागमः ।
न्यन्त्र कारणन्वर्तिनं सच्छास्त्रस्य विनिश्चयः ॥ १८३ ॥

विस्तारधमवनीये तू तदर्थं बहुभदतः ।
शिक्षाजीन्यादिकं चापं यागापं आत्मनक्षत्रम् ॥ १८४ ॥

शक्राश्च ईश्वरप्रतिज्ञानार्थं त्रयमुच्यते ।
शक्राश्च शिवार्तिन्यार्तिक्षार्थं साक्षमुच्यते ॥ १८४ ॥

इत्यर्थः बहुधाकारण्यं दुर्भवाधोद्भिमाख्यत ।
अथस्तथे इदं शास्त्रमित्यर्थः बहुभदतः ॥ १८६ ॥

दमेवंति यद्विष्ट शास्त्रदृष्टानुर्मायत ।
प्रशास्त्रदृष्ट दन्त्यमे सद्यर्वाधिकनक्षत्रम् ॥ १८७ ॥

शास्त्रदृष्टा कृतं यद्य तदर्थं दर्शका मन्तः ।
इत्यकारप्रवर्तुनि तत्प्रकारेण वच्यते ॥ १८८ ॥

सम्प्राप्त्यै केनैतं शक्तिरक्षणं वा पुनः ।
शक्त्यै पुन पक्षेण शक्तिरक्षः स उच्यते ॥ १८९ ॥

शक्त्यै यस्याः नित्यं शम्भुपक्षम्भरा भवतः ।
अपुन्यं प्रवर्तन्यनिर्भूतानां सतिमित्ततः ॥ १९० ॥

अवर्तनधेनुगुह्यं सन्त्यर्थः शम्भुपक्षम् ।
अष्टाविंशतिरेव गाराङ्क इत्ये पुरा ॥ १९१ ॥

सर्विद्युत्तमस्य तू कृतमानं कृतमानम् ।
इदं दृष्ट्वा ऽविन्दुस्य कृतान्तरम् ॥ १९२ ॥

पक्षिगतं शिक्षार्थं शिक्षासारं शिक्षातरम् ।
सद्युतं तू भद्रास्य शिवभेदं च मानसम् ॥ १९३ ॥

शैवकण्डं च कानास्य कानकण्डं शतदृक्म् ।
शैवीश्च कम्बलं काकं काकानुष्टं कटाङ्कम् ॥ १९४ ॥

पूर्ववर्तिनं मूर्ध्नि शान्तं शान्तान्तरम् ।
स्यैवशिवशक्तिभेदा मया प्राक्ताः समासतः ॥ १९५ ॥

पतिनीशमार्थं तू भूतानामनुकम्पया ।
कृतवागादिशिक्षार्थं बहुमन्त्राधेयकृतम् ॥ १९६ ॥

पतिविश्वभेदेन दृग्दृष्टकारसंज्ञितम् ।
अथ पक्षिगतास्य पक्षभेदमतं भवतु ॥ १९७ ॥

इत्यर्थः कुमारं च ा मांभेदज्ञातम् च ।
वैद्यपुत्रं शुभाण्डं च पञ्चभेदाः प्रकीर्तिताः ॥ १९८ ॥

[१९] अर्द्धति पक्षि (comp.) सन्ति पक्षि ms. 154d कटाङ्कम् (comp.) क इकम् ms.
[१९] एषा (comp.) इत्यादाः ms.

गन्धभा त्विच्छासाममानुष्यं कथ्यते ।
जिह्वाशय शिखा वैद्य यः पार महीभट्टः ॥ १११ ॥

कणराज गोत्रभट्ट मम्म । ह्यमाश्रितम् ।
जिह्वाशय शिखा दत्त भण्डारादिभक्षणा ॥ ११० ॥

गृह्यरीय महीकाव गता यत्तज्जिह्वाशयम् ।
राजान् लब्धपण्ड न अष्टुष्टागविषाण्वणम् ॥ १११ ॥

भगव पाण्डुपद न विषयभन मया ।
होवाभ्य वगण्ड न । निवर्तकम् ॥ ११० ॥

मानास भिष्यभण्ड न शाकव जीयक्षणा ।
दशास न भद न कर्षित न जिह्वाशयम् ॥ ११३ ॥

भण्डपण्ड शिखाभ्य न गान्धापुष्ट विवर्त्मकम् ।
भण्डपण्ड शिखाभ्य न राजभुज महीकावम् ॥ १११ ॥

कणामाटपण्ड न हन्धुय महीकावम् ।
हनि ह्रीदजभरास्तु पञ्चाशतसमुद्रवाः ॥ ११४ ॥

वाग्विद्यागुदसमास्तु सर्वे येकमताः स्मृताः ।
भदा स्थला मया ज्ञान शिखा । भव्यभनः ॥ ११६ ॥

पश्चिम ननन्याभ्य ज्ञानभदगन् भवन ।
पञ्च ह्रीदजभरास्तु कण्डु कटकाभयम् ॥ ११७ ॥

कण्ठादी मुण्डमानाभ्य वाक्यैः सङ्ग्राहणम् ।
जण्ड भण्डारिभगणभ्य विवर्त कटिकाभयम् ॥ ११८ ॥

भजाम न जिह्वाशय घञ्च भिह्वाकटम् ।
धाराष्ट्रहामसृष्टि मभयण्ड घटिकाभयम् ॥ ११९ ॥

गन्धुर्विषयभे भुजानामनुभवम् ।
मन्त्रार्थविनाशाय वृक्षार्थं भद ॥ १२० ॥

निवृत्त मेष्टमन्त्राभे मानामन्त्रेण विवृत्तम् ।
विक्लिताष्टोत्थपण्ड दृष्टप्रतिवर्तणम् ॥ १२१ ॥

अष्टमन्त्राभेऽष्टमे यन् ज्ञानन नष्टयति ।
ह्यमाभ्य ग्रथम् यन् ह्याप्यवर्तदिवक्षणा ॥ १२० ॥

द्वितीय वाक्पण्डाभे ह्यपरोक्षेन विवृत्तम् ।
कट्टु र्विक्लिता न मानानामन्त्राभयम् ॥ १२३ ॥

नितकामनिवृत्त्यर्थे चतुर्थे कटकाभयम् ।
नवमन्त्रविनाशाय ज्ञानमन्त्राभयम् ॥ १२४ ॥

वर्तिकाभयदिवक्षणा कण्ठादी पञ्चम स्मृतम् ।
नवमन्त्रविनाशाय धान्वादादिवक्षणा ॥ १२५ ॥

तत्तु मण्डमानाभ्य मष्ट मन्त्राभयम् ।
मन्त्राभयदिवक्षणा सर्वे विधे नान्वाष्टिवक्षणा ॥ १२६ ॥

मन्त्राभयदिवक्षणा सर्वे विधे नान्वाष्टिवक्षणा ॥ १२७ ॥

मन्त्राभयदिवक्षणा सर्वे विधे नान्वाष्टिवक्षणा ॥ १२८ ॥

मन्त्राभयदिवक्षणा सर्वे विधे नान्वाष्टिवक्षणा ॥ १२९ ॥

मन्त्राभयदिवक्षणा सर्वे विधे नान्वाष्टिवक्षणा ॥ १३० ॥

मन्त्राभयदिवक्षणा सर्वे विधे नान्वाष्टिवक्षणा ॥ १३१ ॥

मन्त्राभयदिवक्षणा सर्वे विधे नान्वाष्टिवक्षणा ॥ १३२ ॥

मन्त्राभयदिवक्षणा सर्वे विधे नान्वाष्टिवक्षणा ॥ १३३ ॥

यथार्थनाममुद्दिष्ट भूतवास वयादशम् ।
 गवोऽकृष्णाटथा यव भूताना भयवर्धनः ॥ १८३ ॥

मूढाभेदानि सर्वाणि यागिनीनां च तत्क्षणम् ।
 तथा ह्यूमादिभेद च तच्छिष्टावावकीर्तितम् ॥ १८४ ॥

तन्त्र चतुर्दश देवि गृह्यमन्त्रार्थसंकुलम् ।
 एकभेद तु भूताना तथा व्याख्यादित्लक्षणम् ॥ १८५ ॥

ऋगावतर्ण यच्च तन्निवारणमेव च ।
 भूतयानिषु सर्वासु तदंशानि विभागशः ॥ १८६ ॥

शायन्ते येन तन्त्रेण चर्चन् तन्त्रिपद्यम् ।
 नवलक्षप्रविस्तीर्ण बहुभेदेभ्यु सङ्कुलम् ॥ १८७ ॥

मन्त्रवाद तु यन्मुख्यं तदुक्तं सिंहकोट्यम् ।
 पाराङ्मुहाम देवेशि नृतापिटकनाशनम् ॥ १८८ ॥

भूमिका ज्ञानसयुक्तमुद्दिष्टकयमन्त्रितम् ।
 यत्र प्रयोगसामान्यदृष्टनष्टादित्लक्षणम् ॥ १८९ ॥

इन्द्रजातादिमकीर्णं रोडशं परिकीर्तितम् ।
 दधताना प्रमाणं च यत्जनमुद्दिक्कर्मणि ॥ १९० ॥

नक्रयान् गृह्यसूत्रं शास्त्र्यांष्टादनलक्षणम् ।
 क्षुद्रकर्मोदिकं यत् रोद्रमन्त्रपरिवृतम् ॥ १९१ ॥

उच्छिष्टं नाम तज्ज्ञेयं मन्त्रं यमदशं स्मृतम् ।
 धारणा ज्ञानभेद तु लुप्त्यादिसम्यक्कृतम् ॥ १९२ ॥

त्रिगुण्यं देहपिण्डाद्युत्तराध्याधिविनाशनम् ।
 परचिकीर्षेणन्दं च परकाशप्रवेशनम् ॥ १९३ ॥

आरधना तु यथागम्यितव्यं सद्व्रतस्य ।
 शक्तिं यत्र दत्तं सर्वभूतहितांशना ॥ १९४ ॥

उच्छिष्टं तं वरगोहं तन्त्रमष्टादशं स्मृतम् ।
 कोट्यकर्मणि भूतानां स्वस्वावशानित्लक्षणम् ॥ १९५ ॥

यमाणा भूत ॥ निःशेषं यव वणिनम् ।
 अन्धभेदेन सर्वत्र क्रियाभेदेन निश्चितम् ॥ १९६ ॥

उदयं चैव मन्त्राणां महारमन्त्रवर्णिनम् ।
 अथ यमाणं निःशेषं लोकापानादित्लक्षणम् ॥ १९७ ॥

पूर्वां समाप्तवना यत्रोक्ता परमेश्वर
 हेतुर्नेत्रं यन्मृष्टं यन्मृष्टं भूभूमिना ॥ १९८ ॥

तत्परे यत्र चोद्दिष्टं यमचण्डं तु तं विदुः ।
 एकोनविंशतितमं सार्वकोटीप्रविस्तरम् ॥ १९९ ॥

अतरे विषयं देवि सर्वमन्त्रालयं शुभम् ।
 यत्रोक्तवर्णो यत् ॥ हटोक्तचम् ॥ २०० ॥

पातालचण्डं प्रथमं हटकेष्वरमशकम् ।
 दशधा तन्त्रमन्त्रान् तन्त्रवक्ष्यामि मान्तरः ॥ २०१ ॥

शट्केन पटाख्यं च तथा विषयसम्भवम् ।
 सर्वेन्द्राकं चान्यं तन्त्रानां तन्त्रांशानाम् ॥ २०२ ॥

कुम्भानिमतं चैव मन्त्रं कामरञ्जयम् ।
 गृह्यायैव विष्णुतं दशमामनिकां स्मृता ॥ २०३ ॥

विषयानाम्भेदं च तद्वैदिकं यथाभेदः ।
 कृपायैव तु प्रथमं तथा अमन्त्रयम् ॥ २०४ ॥

कुम्भानि च दशधा यथावत्प्रयामि ते ।
 कुम्भं महाकुम्भं चैव महाकालिकुम्भं तथा ॥ २०५ ॥

विष्णुकुम्भं कामिकुम्भं कुम्भं चूडामणिं तथा ।
 कुम्भं मेखयामान्यं तथा मातृकुम्भं शुभम् ॥ २०६ ॥

विद्याङ्गं जज्ञिकृत् कृत्वा ऽप्रकान्तिनाः ।
प्रसभट यथा दक्षि तस्यमासेन मे शृणु ॥ २७७ ॥

मृष्टिक्रम कान्तिक्रम मङ्गारक्रमसयुतम् ।
अवतारक्रम चान्यदित्य क्रमचतुष्टयम् ॥ २७८ ॥

मृष्टिक्रम चतुर्थो नृ भेदेभवेति पार्वति ।
तानावतार प्रथम लक्षणे कथित मया ॥ २७९ ॥

कृत्वादेतार द्वितीय मन्वावतरण तथा ।
न दक्षि[ता]वतारस्य चतुर्थो मृष्टिरुच्यते ॥ २८० ॥

कान्तिक्रम चतुर्थो वे यथाभेदमुदाहृतम् ।
कान्तिक्रम नृ प्रथम मङ्गाकान्तिक्रम तथा ॥ २८१ ॥

कान्तसंकेपिक्रम तथा पाँचक्रम स्मृतम् ।
मङ्गार च तथा वक्ष्ये यथावत्परमेश्वरि ॥ २८२ ॥

मङ्गारक्रमपूर्वं वे भेदवैशक्तिरसंयुतम् ।
कान्तास्य द्वितीय नाम भावमङ्गारकार्कम् ॥ २८३ ॥

मर्वमङ्गारमग्न च चतुर्थे परिकीर्तितम् ।
क्रमसृष्टिः कृतसृष्टिर्भावसृष्टिस्तृतीयका ॥ २८४ ॥

मृष्टिगुणसृष्टिरिति मृष्टिक्रम विदुः ।
अथाज्याखण्डयज्ञ यज्ञनीय खण्डमुच्यते ॥ २८५ ॥

अथथा तत्त्वमाख्यात तच्छृणुष्व महानये ।
मङ्गारिज्जारादृष्टिश्च विन्ध्यखण्डस्तृतीयकः ॥ २८६ ॥

चान्तिका खण्डसमान्य तथा तारागणोद्भवम् ।
ज्येष्ठभास्यमान्यस्र मित्रतारकमेव च ॥ २८७ ॥

ज्येष्ठा वे सर्वेदोर च श्रुतन्मखण्डय विदुः ।
मङ्गारिज्जारा च तस्य कान्तिभेदेनेकजः ॥ २८८ ॥

विद्याङ्गं जज्ञिकृत् कृत्वा ऽप्रकान्तिनाः ।
प्रसभट यथा दक्षि तस्यमासेन मे शृणु ॥ २८९ ॥

मृष्टिक्रम कान्तिक्रम मङ्गारक्रमसयुतम् ।
अवतारक्रम चान्यदित्य क्रमचतुष्टयम् ॥ २९० ॥

मृष्टिक्रम चतुर्थो नृ भेदेभवेति पार्वति ।
तानावतार प्रथम लक्षणे कथित मया ॥ २९१ ॥

कृत्वादेतार द्वितीय मन्वावतरण तथा ।
न दक्षि[ता]वतारस्य चतुर्थो मृष्टिरुच्यते ॥ २९२ ॥

कान्तिक्रम चतुर्थो वे यथाभेदमुदाहृतम् ।
कान्तिक्रम नृ प्रथम मङ्गाकान्तिक्रम तथा ॥ २९३ ॥

कान्तसंकेपिक्रम तथा पाँचक्रम स्मृतम् ।
मङ्गार च तथा वक्ष्ये यथावत्परमेश्वरि ॥ २९४ ॥

मङ्गारक्रमपूर्वं वे भेदवैशक्तिरसंयुतम् ।
कान्तास्य द्वितीय नाम भावमङ्गारकार्कम् ॥ २९५ ॥

मर्वमङ्गारमग्न च चतुर्थे परिकीर्तितम् ।
क्रमसृष्टिः कृतसृष्टिर्भावसृष्टिस्तृतीयका ॥ २९६ ॥

मृष्टिगुणसृष्टिरिति मृष्टिक्रम विदुः ।
अथाज्याखण्डयज्ञ यज्ञनीय खण्डमुच्यते ॥ २९७ ॥

अथथा तत्त्वमाख्यात तच्छृणुष्व महानये ।
मङ्गारिज्जारादृष्टिश्च विन्ध्यखण्डस्तृतीयकः ॥ २९८ ॥

चान्तिका खण्डसमान्य तथा तारागणोद्भवम् ।
ज्येष्ठभास्यमान्यस्र मित्रतारकमेव च ॥ २९९ ॥

ज्येष्ठा वे सर्वेदोर च श्रुतन्मखण्डय विदुः ।
मङ्गारिज्जारा च तस्य कान्तिभेदेनेकजः ॥ ३०० ॥

मङ्गारिज्जारा च तस्य कान्तिभेदेनेकजः ॥ ३०१ ॥

विन्दुस्वच्छन्दक नाम नादस्वच्छन्दमेव च ।
गौरव कालदण्डं च सूलकाद्य तथैव च ॥ २३१ ॥

कर्मोच्चित्तं च साटोप चन्द्रगर्भं मुराचिंतम् ।
मृत्युनाम चतुर्विंश महाघोरमुदाहृतम् ॥ २३२ ॥

चोर्गचोर्णं प्रवक्ष्यामि ब्रह्म यथकीर्तितम् ।
प्रथम चोर्गचोर्णं च नवकोटिप्रविस्तरम् ॥ २३३ ॥

अष्टाशोतिसहस्राणि भेरुोत्तर्गनायिका ।
चन्द्रिकाख्या भगवतीभेदेर्गानां तु पार्वति ॥ २३४ ॥

तम्बोवर्गं नित्यतृता सुदयास्तमवर्जिता ।
मन्त्रभेदेन कथिता भक्तानां हितकाम्यया ॥ २३५ ॥

अतः परं मृत्युजिह्वं ततः शुष्काकुलं परम् ।
वट्टिपाद भीमशिख हेरुनोर्मिकूलं तथा ॥ २३६ ॥

चित्तुवादं कामदण्डमित्यथो कीर्तिना मया ।
दिशा मुखं चाटविधमधुना मनभेदतः ॥ २३७ ॥

महावेतालसङ्गं च नवम कोलमेव च ।
अधुना साग्रत देवि क्षयिताङ्गं प्रकीर्त्यते ॥ २३८ ॥

चतुर्धा प्रथितं तच्च कालपञ्चेति विवृतम् ।
त्रयवाद्यं दुर्गाख्यं च कल्मषण्डति गीयते ॥ २३९ ॥

मद्भाच्छ्रमं तनां देवि दशधा परिपथ्यते ।
शिखाच्छ्रमं तथा कौली वीरभेदमतः परम् ॥ २४० ॥

अष्टदीर्घाश्च बान्धुमुद्रिकाम महाद्भुतम् ।
शुद्धशिखामनं चापि तथा सारस्वतं मतम् ॥ २४१ ॥

कालजिह्वं कुर्वीरख्यं सिद्धमन्त्रानकं तथा ।
अतः परं प्रवक्ष्यामि क्रीधमन्त्रभेदपरम् ॥ २४२ ॥

अष्टदशं चाख्यातं मरुद्वैद्यं तु पार्वति ।
अनामकं तु प्रथमं चतुर्विंशमिति तथा ॥ २४३ ॥

उद्याख्य मन्त्राभा भङ्गं वैद्वयं प्रथमं ततः ।
शाक्य भद्रपुत्रं च सारामृतमहात्कटम् ॥ २४४ ॥

परावर्तं काष्ठमि ॥ ।
विन्दुस्वच्छन्दक विद्यानिलकमेव च ॥ २४५ ॥

निलक भेरुवाक्यं च यामलं परिपथ्यते ।
अष्टधा यामलं देवि सूत्रान्तं कथयामि ते ॥ २४६ ॥

सुदूरं ब्रह्मभेदं विष्णुभेदं तथैव च ।
वासुदेवभेदं देवि इत्येतदक्षिणं मुखम् ॥ २४७ ॥

उदयान्तं यामाख्यं चतुर्विंशतिभेदतः ।
तेषां मध्ये महातन्त्रं नयसूत्रं त्रयान्तरम् ॥ २४८ ॥

महामाहृतं बान्धुद्वैपालान्त्रं शिखान्तरम् ।
अक्षितं विद्वयं त्वन्यद्विन्तामणिमहादयम् ॥ २४९ ॥

विष्णुभुवनालं च चतुर्वर्गामुत्पादुतम् ।
क तथा ॥ २५० ॥

काकाद्भुतं तु द्रविणं यष्ट गुणाद्भुतं स्मृतम् ।
राविषाद्भुतमतनुं सर्वपुञ्जितकं तथा ॥ २५१ ॥

तस्मात् ॥ सङ्गं तु कथितं सारमन्त्रम् ।
पद्मका स्मृता यत्र भगिन्या भानुभिस्मह ॥ २५२ ॥

सङ्गुक्षमितं देवि न ॥ च्यमनामकम् ।
अतः परं कामधेनुं चतुर्धा परिपथ्यते ॥ २५३ ॥

वृष्णमुखं तु प्रथमं गान्धिकं मानसं तथा ।
अत्रपुण्ड्रं चतुर्थं तु तनां वन्द्यं कर्मयकम् ॥ २५४ ॥

समधा भेदभिन्न तत्प्रथमं च कर्म्यकम् ।
सम्पुशमित्तिनाय तु स्मत्माय मोक्षने तथा ॥ २४५ ॥

मिहाराज वातमुख नीवंन्म समम् स्मृतम् ।
अमन्त तु ततो वक्ष्ये पञ्चधा मणव ॥ ते ॥ २४६ ॥

अनामक भिन्नशीपमेकदोर् वनोत्कटम् ।
अन्माराज तथा देवि श्रीक श्रुकाद्विनि-मृतम् ॥ २४७ ॥

वामदेवं कथित भागवन्म हितेपिशा ।
वक्त्रे द्वादशसादृशो श्रीकाव्या सहिता शुभा ॥ २४८ ॥

महामन्त्रगणाकीर्णो सङ्गुह्या तु पावन्ति ।
यस्या अष्टानुत् भूतं देवैरात्मसमेः शुभैः ॥ २४९ ॥

वामाचार्यदेवि ब्रह्मादीः कोटिसंख्या ।
वत्क तु ततो वक्ष्ये नवतुषो प्रकीर्तितम् ॥ २६० ॥

तयचतुक् प्रथम विजयाख्य तथैव च ।
तयन्त्याख्य तृतीय तु तथा चैवापरजितम् ॥ २६१ ॥

वत्क प्रतिभेदश्च नवधा यव कीर्त्यने ।
महामन्त्रालय गुह्य ततो वै बीजपञ्चम् ॥ २६२ ॥

नवतुषो समाख्यात पञ्चम शक्तिपञ्चम् ।
बीजपञ्चक देवि तथा सारम्वन मतम् ॥ २६३ ॥

आनन्दाख्य सहितार्थ लक्षणाधैविन्मम् ।
सर्वमन्त्रादिमयुक् सवस्त्राख्यज्ञे महत् ॥ २६४ ॥

शवीख्य वन्द्यकल सोमाराज कलाम्बम् ।
तथा मिद्धमन देवि पञ्चधा परिपश्यदे ॥ २६५ ॥

किङ्कराज ततो वक्ष्ये येन ज्ञानन सिद्धानि ।
क्षेत्रदकमत नित्य हाटकश विरर्जितम् ॥ २६६ ॥

द्वीमुख तत्प्रभेद मन्त्राख्य मनोमनम् ।
एतन्मन्त्रविध देवि तथा वक्ष्ये पञ्चदशम् ॥ २६७ ॥

मिद्धकीच मारास तथा विद्याष्टक शुभम् ।
कामेश्वर मिद्धाराज पञ्चधा परिर्कीर्तितम् ॥ २६८ ॥

वत्तुविर्जितभेदेन मूल्यावसम्बुद्धैः ।
सङ्गुह्येगुह्यमन्त्रैश्च सर्वकामार्थसाधकैः ॥ २६९ ॥

सुन्दकोटिप्रविम्बो वामवक्त्रमुदाहृतम् ।
अन्मन्त्रक्षेपता वक्ष्ये मीमा यन्मन्त्रभेट्टिना ॥ २७० ॥

नेवा भेद प्रवक्ष्यामि वत्तुप्रतिमाराजः ।
भेद्व यामन देवि मन्त्राख्य पिङ्गल तथा ॥ २७१ ॥

चक्राष्टक शिवाष्ट च वङ्गम् च यत्रमम् ।
वामाष्टवाष्टयत्राकमष्टम वीरवन्दिते ॥ २७२ ॥

एतन्मन्त्राणि च तत्र कथयामि समासतः ।
स्वच्छन्त्रभेदवृष्टः कोष उन्मन्त्रभेद्व ॥ २७३ ॥

अमिताङ्ग महाच्छृणुं कार्पाणाष्टमं मतम् ।
ब्रह्मवामलमित्युक्त वेताल चाष्टमं स्मृतम् ॥ २७४ ॥

विष्णुवामलक तथा स्कन्दमुमा रूचैव ।
समम् रूढमित्युक्त वेताल चाष्टमं स्मृतम् ॥ २७५ ॥

पण्डभेदाः स्मृता द्विते भेद्वे वीरवन्दिते ।
भेद्वी प्रथमा श्रीका पिङ्गलममुद्रवा ॥ २७६ ॥

सा द्विधा भेदतः ख्याता तृतीय च तथाच्यते ।
श्रीदी कलाचतुर्थी च विजयाख्या तु पञ्चमी ॥ २७७ ॥

चन्द्राख्या चैव पृथी स्यात्सङ्गता सर्वसङ्गता ।
एते ते सङ्गता भेदाः कोषेन तु भाविताः ॥ २७८ ॥

प्रथम मन्त्रचक्रं तु वर्षचक्रं द्वितीयकम् ।

तृतीय शक्तिचक्रं तु कलाचक्रं चतुर्थकम् ॥ २७९ ॥

पञ्चम चिन्दचक्रं तु षष्ठं वै नादमञ्जितम् ।

सप्तम गूढचक्रं तु अष्टमं चाष्टमं मतम् ॥ २८० ॥

एते वै चक्रमेवासु अमिताङ्गन भाषिताः ।

अन्धक रन्ध्रद च भुजाख्यं मूलमष्टकम् ॥ २८१ ॥

कलामोटं विडङ्गं च स्वातिन्या मातुरेदनम् ।

एते स्यच्छन्दभेदाश्च बहुरूपेण भाषिताः ॥ २८२ ॥

भेरवीं तु शिल्पा प्रोक्ता वीणा वै द्वितीयका ।

वीणामणिस्तुर्ताय तु ममोहं तु चतुर्थकम् ॥ २८३ ॥

पञ्चम डामरं नाम षष्ठं वैवास्यधवेकम् ।

कवन्धं सप्तमं ख्यातं शिखच्छुद्धमथाष्टकम् ॥ २८४ ॥

एतं दैवि शिल्पाभेदा उन्मत्तेन तु भाषिताः ।

एतत्साराशिवं चक्रमष्टाष्टकविभेदतः ॥ २८५ ॥

श्रोतोंड्रवमिदं पूज्यमनन्तं तद्विभूषितम् ।

अनन्तभास्करेण अनन्तरेण भाषितम् ॥ २८६ ॥

शक्तिव्रतयमभिन्नं मुद्रारत्नविमर्षितम् ।

अनेकाकारमभिन्नं महामण्डलनायकम् ॥ २८७ ॥

विविधामुद्रप्रसङ्गाणि दिव्यवक्राम्बुजोद्भवम् ।

विभ्रात्काटिनिवद्वायुं हृदि तन्वाः प्रकीर्तिताः ॥ २८८ ॥

नवकाटिप्रविस्नीर्णं मिदृशयोगैरीमतम् ।

सार्धकाटिजयाक्रान्तिं नन्वाण्यन्यानि भेरवि ॥ २८९ ॥

नक्षार्धेनक्षभेदनं पञ्चाङ्गना वगनने ।

सदृशपयसम्यानात्मना पञ्चाशतानि च ॥ २९० ॥

अनाधं शक्तिका धैव अत्र ततो ऽध भाषिणि ।

हेविस्माराशिवे तन्त्र अन्यं चानन्तमष्टिकं ॥ २९१ ॥

अन्तं गूढास्तु रुद्राख्यं विद्याख्यं चापरं तथा ।

शङ्कते तु महान्त्ये गुरुपङ्क्तिप्रयं तथा ॥ २९२ ॥

गुरुभाषिकगुणैः वृद्धापहङ्गारं तथैव च ।

ततः श्रीकण्ठनाथेन विष्णुन मूर्ष्टिसागरे ॥ २९३ ॥

शिवः शिल्पा तथा स्वातिर्विमलश्च चतुर्थकः ।

तस्यः सकाशादाख्यानं ततो ऽमर्त्यमुपारातम् ॥ २९४ ॥

मुद्रामण्डलपीठं तु पञ्चरीठं तथैव च ।

विद्यापीठं तथा शक्तं चतुर्णीठा तु संहिता ॥ २९५ ॥

शंकरादसौमकोमारं मौसनिजाजलिं तथा ।

विमर्तं चाष्टह्नाय च पारम्बच्छन्दमष्टकम् ॥ २९६ ॥

दुर्वासमेचकं वैव तथा सारम्बतं परम् ।

वषट्प च फेडारं पञ्चमं परिकीर्तितम् ॥ २९७ ॥

रुक्माख्यं तम्पटाख्यं च सप्तमां ब्रह्मयामलम् ।

हंसपक्षिणामातङ्गमेकतीगम्बुषीकरम् ॥ २९८ ॥

वासदेवेन सहितं सप्तमां पारमेस्वरम् ।

हंसपारमेस्वरं यत्तद्विधां परिचयते ॥ २९९ ॥

पाटयन्निहिताख्यं लक्ष्मेनैवतिविस्तरम् ।

यक्षिणी परमेशं च तवधा परिचयते ॥ ३०० ॥

किरणाख्यं नन्दिमतं ह्यमिनीं ब्रह्ममण्डलम् ।

स्यात्तुभुवं स्कन्धमतं प्रतिष्ठापारमेस्वरम् ॥ ३०१ ॥

विशुक्लस्य मगार्गीयं नवकोटिप्रविस्तरम् ।

सातह्नाख्यं च यत्तन्वा विधा तत्परिचयते ॥ ३०२ ॥

कल्पशाखा तु मानङ्गमुगन्धाख्या च महिता ।
पुरुर्वीर द्विधा भद्र साधेत्तक्षत्रयं विदुः ॥ ३०३ ॥

पेनामहमेकवीर्यमन्वाख्य पञ्चधा ततः ।
अम्बासदा गुह्यसुख तथाप्यल्पिङ्गलामतम् ॥ ३०४ ॥

प्रणिष्ठापद्वेदीक्षाणमित्येतत्पञ्चधा स्थितम् ।
पौष्करं देवि यत्तन्त्रं मनधा परिपद्यते ॥ ३०५ ॥

पूष्करं ब्रह्मवर्द्धी च तथा नारायणीयकम् ।
कुर्वन्पद्मं कालिञ्जं तथा ह्यल्लोहलं मतम् ॥ ३०६ ॥

योगिर्नामतमन्यञ्च वामदेवसंधोच्यते ।
वामदेवं चतुष्काख्यं तथा तुमुन्पन्नम् ॥ ३०७ ॥

सर्वेष्टमेतद्विदुः । अन्यच्च गुह्यपद्मं गणान्तिके ।
तन्त्रशाखा देववर्द्धी सर्वमन्त्राणीव परम् ॥ ३०८ ॥

अष्टधा कथितं देवि समकोटिप्रविन्तरम् ।
नीलाम्बरं मृगतारं च मन्त्रायोगिनि ज्ञामरम् ॥ ३०९ ॥

स्वायम्भुवं विद्वमतं गणाख्यं श्वेचरीमतम् ।
अष्टौ कौलाख्यमीत्याताः सद्यः प्रत्ययकारकाः ॥ ३१० ॥

नवमं तु महाकीलं यन्मृगैरपि दुर्लभम् ।
मानं समुद्रव पीठं कौलाख्यं तन्त्रमेव च ॥ ३११ ॥

सुन्दरीपटं चतुर्धा तु योगिभिः परिपद्यते ।
यान्तरीपटारपीठं च गृह्यपीठं समान्तिकम् ॥ ३१२ ॥

सन्तरीपटं च दशधा यथावन्कथयामि ते ।
सन्तरीपटं तु सिद्धाख्यं जालं च मथानरम् ॥ ३१३ ॥

हन्तरीपटमिष्टमर्धे च सन्तरीपटं मृगाम्भुजम् ।
जटरीपटं विन्दरीपटं चक्रपीठं महेश्वरि ॥ ३१४ ॥

मन्त्रार्धं वामदर्शं तु पञ्चधा परिकीर्तितम् ।
पटुशान्तमिदं श्रेष्ठं पञ्चशाखाद्वयान्तरम् ॥ ३१५ ॥

त्रिधा कर्मक्षत्रं पूर्वं मौलाख्या चित्रण परम् ।
पार्वीमतं हस्तोक्तिं वासुकिः पञ्चमं स्मृतम् ॥ ३१६ ॥

अधोमोतोडवा एतं भद्राः पानान्तमष्टकाः ।
तन्त्रं महितमुत्र च समग्रं शान्तमवच ॥ ३१७ ॥

कल्पारुख्यं तथा कल्पमागमं समधा विदुः ।
चक्रार्धं परिवागकं वनृधं पञ्चकं तथा ॥ ३१८ ॥

पञ्चाभिमतार्धे च दशधा बहुलं तु यत् ।
यत्स्यवाक्कमयत्कल्पान्तमनन्दं च कीर्तितं ॥ ३१९ ॥

महिताधं तु पुरातनं मध्यन्तरधेविनिश्चयम् ।
मागत्सातन्त्रं यत् महिताधे तदुच्यते ॥ ३२० ॥

गृह्यार्धमल्यग्रन्थं यद्वैष्णवमाणमनेकधा ।
तत्सुवार्धे समुद्दिष्टमाद्यन्तान्तविनिश्चितम् ॥ ३२१ ॥

सद्यश्चार्धे च विन्तारं कालान्तमिति ततः ।
व्यत्यार्धमल्यग्रन्थं च समग्रं तेन कीर्तितम् ॥ ३२२ ॥

अनुशासयिता यत्र अनुशास्यादितिक्षणम् ।
शान्त्यग्रामाख्यनिर्दिष्टं ज्ञाननाच्छान्दम्यमुच्यते ॥ ३२३ ॥

एका शक्तिः शिष्यैको बहुभेदोपचर्यते ।
भेदं तु कल्पनामात्रमकदशादितिक्षणम् ॥ ३२४ ॥

व्यत्यग्रशान्त्यग्रमयन्ताकल्पमन्त्रेह कल्पितः ।
कल्पनां वन्यमहं तदवतार्यावतारकम् ॥ ३२५ ॥

तैशाधिकमिदं तन्त्रं कल्पं स्कन्धं तदुच्यते ।
इति ज्ञागमसबन्धं मनधा परिकीर्तितम् ॥ ३२६ ॥

मन्त्रमूलाणि भेदानि मन्त्रद्वयानि यानि तु ।
तानि मन्त्रः शिवभेदानि षट्श्रोताः कथितानि तु ॥ ३२७ ॥

शब्दानां वक्रमाकारानि मन्त्रनन्त्राणि यानि तु ।
ज्ञानार्णवसमुत्तानि मोक्षार्थफलदानि तु ॥ ३२८ ॥

इत्य शिवन श्रीकण्ठ श्रोतंभेदः प्रदर्शितः ।

Appendix 2
Verse Index

atārdhākāśātaly	55	attha bhūmasvārūpam tad	303c
aghoṣaveriḥ devasya	147j	adeśakile tātve hi	368a
aghorāḥ śrāṣṭakāyāḥ	353j	advāne bhāiravavibhau	112c
ajām iva tad viśvām	259j	adhunā tai sthitaṃ grāhyam	208a
ajām naiva vā kva cit	72b	adhyāmasiddhayaḥ yuktyā	283c
an eva divajayam	130a	adhvasiddhyādhkam dvāite	122a
ata eva na śi vṛth	263c	anantaśrīyāśm-vād	368c
ata eva parā śyam	353a	anantaśrīvairāyād	290c
ata eva mahesinā	385b	anantādivirāḥanta	358a
ata eva vicitrābhyaḥ	375c	ananyonyoparodhana	167c
ata eva vināḍha ye	60a	anavacchinnaḥṛdaya	39c
ata eva hi nūtajyāt	394c	anavacchā pravartate	59d
ata eva hi śāḍakhye	187c	anābhūtam ca nō vāstu	219a
ata evātra visara	209c	anyāntiraśaśbhāvad	15a
ata evāsti saṃhāra	196c	anilam nīlam ityādī	269c
atāḥve na bhāṣate	62b	anutaravikāśadyaj	19a
atā ca śaḍroḇe unīn	255c	’nūpapattiḥ vaksyate	122b
atā ca saṃpādo devyā	241a	anopūḍher abhinūyaya	203c
atā caṃkayukto ’sau	288c	anekayuktidālita	210c
atā caṃbhāvyanākhila	113c	anekasvarasambhāra	180a
atāśrīyakam ākūḥ	192c	antāyoharivādevāmśa	146c
atā deṃtam bhāṣakāyā	114c	antāśhasarvasāktitve	253a
atā nūvāśodhana	266a	antāśhasvāśmṛṇṇān	146c
atā bhedaśyavāśhayam	274c	antāśhayaḥ abhinūyāḥ	172c
atā śāḍṣtam eva svapn	231a	antāśīratayā bhāṣi	388c
atā bhāvayamāḥ	55a	anyātra tanyatam nāma	102a
atā śaktirayam mukhyam	167a	anyāntarpi kṛyāsāktih	354c
atā śāḍyā ’vābhāṣate	259b	anyāśāḥ kṛandāśdyagho	132c
atā ca-ṣṭatām yām	211a	anyat apy ātha vā prabhob	96d
atā caḥṣṭatām yām	211a	anyod aspenḍitam jñānam	332a
atāpi pūṇābhāṣāṇāḥ	275a	anyāśāṇā gūṇābhāṣā	168c
atāpi mātābhāṣāṇāḥ	163c	anyāśāṇāṣaśmṛḍhye	339c
atāpi nūvāśāḍyāḥ	48a	anyāśya eva bhāṣāḥ	38d
atāpi nūvāśāḍyāḥ	296d	anyāśāḥ v. anāśyātā	319d
atāpi nūvāśāḍyāḥ	289c	aparaḍparapṛīṇam	398c

[illegible]

1

evam bhavaparakṣaḥ	473
evam hi dvīdāśanbhardham	166x
evam atarpi paśyati	343
evam eva dāmasāyam	386x
evam evatāḍ āśmīnam	314x
evavet vacanaḥkramah	166h
eva sphārah pratyate	173b
evāḥ kalpante	274b
evāpavāḥ śhīdāt	473
evācyenetaḥatyagad	12x
nucityad vīvādhikā	361x
audāsyadadant vīvāh	266d
katham kartavyam dīpāt	375d
katham kuryati in sphutam	369d
katham evadhātāvāḥ syāt	149c
katham tad upapadyate	308d
katham ityeti gyaṇam	356b
katham vīma prakāṣate	91b
katham bhaved aho nūdhāḥ	75c
katham vyutpadyatāḥ avant	79d
katham śāstrotisampadāḥ	25b
katham samyam tad eva	204b
katham sampadyasya tē	304a
katham aḥ adisambhavaḥ	363b
kāhiteyādītiḥ param	94h
kudicī karṇa bhavet	310d
kādicē api sambhvet	343d
kādicē upadyate	58b
kāpāḥlāḥbhāraṇāḥ	232a
kāpāḥsāṁcāpāṇa	200a
kān ānśan kumbhākarāḥ	342a
kāraṇāḥ tava bhavām	332a
kārotes tāra ko rāḥy syāt	330c
kārdam samapagāman	323b
kārdāḥ sāyam (tāḥm to)	249c
kārtam kām prāṇ hanta	313d
kārtum vāḥḥ api kṣamā	66b
kārtum yētiḥ sabhāḥ	334b
kārtum ity eva yad rūpam	336a
kārtu avyāyēkāḥkṣāḥ	311b
kārtuvāsyāchārgam	322b
kārtvāni kāmavāḥkṣāḥ	324b
kārtm aṇi nādvāḥ ity api	347b
kārtvāḥvāpūḥḥ	315d
kārtvāḥvāḥ bhavāḥ	336d
kārtvāḥvāḥvāḥkṣāḥ	321d
kārtmāḥ vā sambhūḥḥ	443d

[illegible]

kin anyan'nyakidambanari	276
kin impi ap' nurali paripanyan'nyak	382a
kin etad it'i dharani	
kumbukladi 30' 235a	32a
kunubun' pi ki'nyat tatal	314
kuryan' bhadavanti kiryam	309b
kuryan' bhadavanti	340b
kut'vayanaun caracaran	373a
ktiv'ay sa tapralaksepas	117c
kryaiyati saukunaryatati	22d
kryasipati timirapadoti	384
kryasipati ksepasas ciran	366b
keci sam'vitiimadkan	316b
kenpi paramesini	245b
kevalan kvapy anyaiyay	194c
ko 'pi hidihi pravarate	44c
ko 'pi anyi tu kumamnen	313b
ko 'py anyi kumamnen	348b
ko 'ham kim k'vay tami	638b
ko vabina'avagupte 's'min	159c
lauliki parip'vibhate	395b
kranad unmesite tavin	173a
kranena bhoogiyepayay	256a
kranena vadin'nyagapad	72c
kryajina'bhavibhilyay	44c
krya'ni namasi kicana	299b
krya'ni nima namaiakam	302c
krya'sakiti abhanyava	295a
krya'sakiti it' preska	308a
krya'sakiti it'yan pari	347b
krya'sakiti v'vibhanyem	355c
krya'sakitisavariubhat	359d
krya'sakites phutab spharo	173c
krya'sakites vijimbhane	172d
krodhik'vay abhani tu	357
krudhik'vay abhani	396b
k'vay kim sayam nuryayanti	204d
kvayp tatal avallayin	195c
k'vanyati tishthati anyanabhi	276d
k'vanyati vinirasi'vibhahiti	146b
k'vabhadavanti bhan'vibhahiti	40b
k'vabhadavanti v'vibhahiti	38c
k'vabhadavanti v'vibhahiti	130a
k'vabhadavanti v'vibhahiti	241d
kvayp tatal mulek'viti	94d
kvayp tatal mulek'viti	99b
kvayp tatal mulek'viti	236d

paṇibho bhāṣitāḥ ślokaḥ	160a	juṣṭa viśakṣo bodho	372c
paṇibho 'pī gṛāyāṁ	161a	śūdrā viśakṣo bodho	380c
paṇinā ca dīṇān ca	114a	janayā bhāṣāṇa kṣap tā	301a
paṇiṇa vyāyācā	8d	jayatā bhāṣāṇa epāt	310a
paṇiṇa ālpeṇa bhūtyācā	150b	jayantī jagadānanda	76c
paṇiṇa gūḍāyānācā	150b	jayanti samviddimā	76c
paṇiṇa gūḍāyānācā	150b	jñānī sūdrāyānācā	155b
paṇiṇa bhāṣāṇa bhavet	157a	jñānam yadānācā	333d
paṇiṇaḥ tāṭṭhācā	157a	jñānam yajñāyānācā	311b
paṇiṇaḥ vācā	274	jñāna karmavicāritāḥ	379b
paṇiṇaḥ yācā sāstrāḥ	565a	jñānācānāmarācāyā	149d
paṇiṇaḥ prākāśo	578c	jñānācāyāyāyoditāḥ	399d
paṇiṇaḥ pūjācā	110b	jñānācāyā vijñānācā	175b
paṇiṇa abhūta śāstrāḥ	135b	jñānācā vijñānācā	391d
paṇiṇa nānācā samvācā	149b	śāstrāśāstrī abhū śāstrā	91d
paṇiṇaśāstrā bhāṣā	121b	jñānāśāstrī vikāntī	261b
paṇiṇaḥ yajñācā	279b	jñānācāyā variprīṭ	187a
paṇiṇaśāstrācācācā	144b	jñānācāyā yajñā jñānā	267a
paṇiṇaśāstrācācā	144b	jñānācāyā yajñā yajñā	301b
paṇiṇaśāstrācācā	158d	jñānācāyā yajñā yajñā	301b
paṇiṇaśāstrācācā	233c	jñānācāyā yajñā yajñā	301b
paṇiṇaśāstrācācā	45b	jñānācāyā yajñā yajñā	301b
paṇiṇaśāstrācācā	33a	jñānācāyā yajñā yajñā	301b
paṇiṇaśāstrācācā	219d	jñānācāyā yajñā yajñā	301b
paṇiṇaśāstrācācā	62d	jñānācāyā yajñā yajñā	301b
paṇiṇaśāstrācācā	137d	jñānācāyā yajñā yajñā	301b
paṇiṇaśāstrācācā	370a	jñānācāyā yajñā yajñā	301b
paṇiṇaśāstrācācā	170a	jñānācāyā yajñā yajñā	301b
paṇiṇaśāstrācācā	248a	jñānācāyā yajñā yajñā	301b
paṇiṇaśāstrācācā	317d	jñānācāyā yajñā yajñā	301b
paṇiṇaśāstrācācā	26b	jñānācāyā yajñā yajñā	301b
paṇiṇaśāstrācācā	160a	jñānācāyā yajñā yajñā	301b
paṇiṇaśāstrācācā	272a	jñānācāyā yajñā yajñā	301b
paṇiṇaśāstrācācā	110a	jñānācāyā yajñā yajñā	301b
paṇiṇaśāstrācācā	370b	jñānācāyā yajñā yajñā	301b
paṇiṇaśāstrācācā	24a	jñānācāyā yajñā yajñā	301b
paṇiṇaśāstrācācā	250b	jñānācāyā yajñā yajñā	301b
paṇiṇaśāstrācācā	106d	jñānācāyā yajñā yajñā	301b
paṇiṇaśāstrācācā	382c	jñānācāyā yajñā yajñā	301b
paṇiṇaśāstrācācā	370b	jñānācāyā yajñā yajñā	301b
paṇiṇaśāstrācācā	80b	jñānācāyā yajñā yajñā	301b
paṇiṇaśāstrācācā	270c	jñānācāyā yajñā yajñā	301b

jādānā bhakṣoṇo bodho 372c
 jādānā vikkāṇo bodho 89c
 jāyate jñānam ekam tat 301a
 jāyate bhāṣājanā be
 jāyati jāgadanāda 14c
 jāyati samvādināda 7c
 jānā sādhyāyopadāna 155b
 jānāyā yatiṇam eviṇam 333d
 jānāyā varogāyānibhāra 231b
 jānā karmavacintitā 379b
 jānā cānānāmarikāyab 14d
 jānā cānānārikāyayoditā 399d
 jānā bhāṣā vīrjibhāṣe 155b
 jānā sāttā vīrjibhāṣe 391d
 jānā sāktir abam sēritā 91d
 jānā sāktir vikaṣiṇī 261b
 jānā sāktisvarāṇiṇī 187d
 jānā sāktir vāyā jimbhā 267a
 jānā dūyāllāsa vārtamā 155b
 jānā dūyānā vā vācānā 330b
 jānā nānādam cā nīrdvānāpā 120a
 jānā cchāyā nānāvācā 332c
 jāgādā sēyāyā cā mukhyā 368c
 jānā yā bhāṣānā vārtā 255a
 jānām tēchan sayānā 313c
 jāne ghāṭapājā vī 71d
 jāne, nāvāṣiṇī kāṣā 7a
 jānāti seyaṇā nāthavā 261a
 jānāti chan prayatāte 333c
 jānāti yā tad āpānā 313c
 jāyate khecchāṣā kṣāṇī 153b
 jāyate khecchāṣā svayām 153b
 jāyate yāvād uddāyitē 150a
 jāyate rudarūpāṣā 251a
 jāyate vā vābaddhānā 375c
 jāyate sūdhātē sarasvathī 102d
 jāyānā mukhāramena cā 194d
 jimbhite satvā sarge 31c
 jānānaklādā dābhā 298a
 jivāyānāṣā pūnāh pūnā 228a
 tā evā pādānāte 290a
 tā cā cā vādmāgānā nāyā 331c
 tā cā cāyukānā prakāśyā 79a
 tā cācānānānter esānt 110a
 tā jīdāyā arpayā sādā 317c
 tā jīdāyānā bhāṣānā 367b
 tāta evā prakāśitā 347d

[illegible]

- Āgamasūtrāṇa* A taprakaranam, ed. Vrajavallabha Divedi, Varanasi 1966 (Yoga-tantra-Granthamālā 12).
- Āgamasūtrāṇa* Āgamasūtrāṇa Others (we called Sanmazanāśaka of Jyanta Bhata. Ed. by V. Rajhasan & Anantalal Thakur, Darbhanga: Mithila Institute 1962. Mithila Institute Series, Ancient Text 7).
- Āgamasūtrāṇa* Āgamasūtrāṇa of Yāmāśāstra, Ed. M. Narasimhaacharya, Baroda Oriental Institute 1976 (Gaekwad's Oriental Series 194).
- Āgamasūtrāṇa* *Āgamasūtrāṇa* [also: *Tantrapaddhati*, *Siddhāntasūtra*], ed. Ganapati Sastri, Trivandrum Sanskrit Series 69, 72, 77 & 83, Trivandrum 1920-25.
- Āgamasūtrāṇa* *Āgamasūtrāṇa* - TORRELLA.
- Āgamasūtrāṇa* *Āgamasūtrāṇa* (The Īśvarapratyabhijñā of Upaladeva with the Vimarsinī), ed. Abhinavagupta, 2 vols., Delhi: [?], Buda & Company 1964 [reprint of KSTS 2, 23, 1917/21].
- Āgamasūtrāṇa* *Āgamasūtrāṇa* (= Bhāṭṭarvamarṇi The Īśvarapratyabhijñā Vimarsinī), ed. Abhinavagupta, Ed. by Madhusudan Kaul, 3 vols., Bombay: Narmada Sagar Press 1936/41/43 (KSTS 6/9/2/65).
- Āgamasūtrāṇa* *Āgamasūtrāṇa* - TORRELLA (1994a).
- Āgamasūtrāṇa* - *Siddhāntasūtra*.
- Āgamasūtrāṇa* - *Nityavodasādhana*.
- Āgamasūtrāṇa* Karmikāgamaḥ Pūrvaśālagāh Ed. Svāmīnātha Śivācārya, Madras: Dakṣiṇa Bharataśāstraśāstrī, 1975.
- Āgamasūtrāṇa* Kāvyaśāstraśāstra of Mammata with English Translation, by Gangasādhā Jha, Delhi 1965.
- Āgamasūtrāṇa* Kāvyaśāstrīyāśāstra of Rājāśekhara, ed. by C.D. Dalal and R.A. Sanyal, Baroda 1934 (Gaekwad's Oriental Series 1).
- Āgamasūtrāṇa* - *Śrīrāmānand* (1985).
- Āgamasūtrāṇa* Kullānava Tantra, Introduction: Arthur Avalon, Readings M.P. Pandit Sanskrit Text: Tārānātha Vidyaratna, Delhi 1964.
- Āgamasūtrāṇa* *Āgamasūtrāṇa* Srinad Bhagavad Gita, With Commentary by Mahāśaśvara Rājānaka Abhinava Gupta, Ed. Pandit Lakṣman Raina, Srinagar 1933.
- Āgamasūtrāṇa* *Āgamasūtrāṇa* in RAGHAVAN (1990), p. 1-16.
- Āgamasūtrāṇa* *Āgamasūtrāṇa* of Madharaja Ed. P.N. Pushp, Srinagar 1960 (KSTS 85).
- Āgamasūtrāṇa* *Āgamasūtrāṇa* Rājānaka Bhāṣakarakāṇṭha's Cittaśubodhasāstra, Ed. by Subhama Pandey, Varanasi 1990 (Āgamasūtrāṇamālā).
- Āgamasūtrāṇa* - *Āgamasūtrāṇa*.
- Āgamasūtrāṇa* The Tantrasaṅgāhā Dhānaka, Ed. with notes by Mul and Rām Śāstrī [?], Bombay 1918 (KSTS 24).
- Āgamasūtrāṇa* The Tantrasaṅgāhā of Abhinavagupta, Ed. with notes by Mukunda Ram Sastri, Delhi: Ban Prakashan 1993 [Reprint of KSTS 17, Bombay 1918].
- Āgamasūtrāṇa* *Āgamasūtrāṇa* The Tantrāloka of Abhinavagupta with the Commentary of Jayaratha, Ed. by R.C. Divedi and Navjivan Rastogi, (Enlarged Edition with Introduction) 8 vols., Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass 1987 [Sanskrit text is a reprint of the edition princeps KSTS 1918/1938].
- Āgamasūtrāṇa* - *Āgamasūtrāṇa* (1920).

- Āgamasūtrāṇa* *Āgamasūtrāṇa* - Kṣha of Sadyojyoti with Commentary, ed. by Ramakrishna P. M. Kaul, Srinagar 1926 (KSTS XLV).
- Āgamasūtrāṇa* *Āgamasūtrāṇa* - Kṣha with two Commentaries Rujumarsini by Śaṅkaradeva and Abhinavagupta, Ed. by Vidyānanda, Edited by VRAJAVALLABHA DIVEDI, Varanasi 1966 (Yoga-tantra-granthamālā 1).
- Āgamasūtrāṇa* *Āgamasūtrāṇa* by Lakṣmīdeva, Ms. Stein Or. d. 43, Bodleian Library, Oxford.
- Āgamasūtrāṇa* *Āgamasūtrāṇa* With Commentary by Kshemarāja, Ed. by Madhusudan Kaul, Bombay 1926/39 (KSTS 46/61).
- Āgamasūtrāṇa* - BHATTACHARYA, Mysore, Oriental Research Institute.
- Āgamasūtrāṇa* *Āgamasūtrāṇa* by Gautama & Bhāṣya of Mahārī Vātsyāyana, Ed. Dyankāśa Narmada, Baudha Bharati 1989.
- Āgamasūtrāṇa* *Āgamasūtrāṇa* 1945.
- Āgamasūtrāṇa* *Āgamasūtrāṇa* Kālaghuvriti by Abhinavagupta, Ed. by Jagadīśvara Zādo, Srinagar 1947 (KSTS 68).
- Āgamasūtrāṇa* The Bhāṣya of Kshemarāja, Ed. with notes by Mukunda Rāma Śāstrī [?], Bombay 1918 (KSTS 15).
- Āgamasūtrāṇa* *Āgamasūtrāṇa* Abhinavagupta and his Works, p. 33-69.
- Āgamasūtrāṇa* *Āgamasūtrāṇa* *Āgamasūtrāṇa*.
- Āgamasūtrāṇa* *Āgamasūtrāṇa* The Īśvarabhijñā Hridaya, Being a Summary of the Doctrines of the Advaita Śaiva Philosophy of Kashmir by Kshemarāja, [Ed. by Jagadīśvara Chandra Chatterji] Srinagara sampat 1668 [sic!] (KSTS 3).
- Āgamasūtrāṇa* *Āgamasūtrāṇa*, Avalon, Calcutta 1935 (Tantiri Texts XVIII).
- Āgamasūtrāṇa* *Āgamasūtrāṇa* *Āgamasūtrāṇa*.
- Āgamasūtrāṇa* *Āgamasūtrāṇa* [Bodhapañcāśikā und Anuttaraprakāśapañcāśikā], mumbai, tatsvivaveka press, KSTS].
- Āgamasūtrāṇa* *Āgamasūtrāṇa* *Āgamasūtrāṇa* of Abhinavagupta, Sanskrit Text with the Commentary Bhāṣārī, Ed. by K.A. Subramania Iyer and Kānti Chandra Pandey, General Editor: R.C. Divedi, 3 Vols., Delhi 1986 [Reprint of: Princess of Wales Saraswati Bhavana Texts No. 70/83/84, Allahabad [?], 1938-1954].
- Āgamasūtrāṇa* The Manuscript with the Commentary Manvartamuktāvali of Kullūka, ed. by Nityan Rām Āchārya, Published by Satyabhābā Pēndurang, For the Nityan Sagar Press, Bombay 1946.
- Āgamasūtrāṇa* *Āgamasūtrāṇa* The Mahānavapraśāsa, Ed. by Sāmbhava Śāstrī, Trivandrum 1937 (Trivandrum Sanskrit Series CXXX, Śrīmadayamañjari XIV).
- Āgamasūtrāṇa* *Āgamasūtrāṇa* The Mahānavamajjari with the Commentary, Pāṇinī of Mahāśaśvara-Parānanda, Ed. by T. Ganapati Śāstrī [?], (Trivandrum Sanskrit Series 6).
- Āgamasūtrāṇa* *Āgamasūtrāṇa* The Mahāśaśvara-Nanda with Commentary of the Author, Ed. with notes by Mukunda Rāma Śāstrī [?], Bombay 1918 (KSTS 11) [abridged version of the commentary].
- Āgamasūtrāṇa* *Āgamasūtrāṇa* The Mānimeyodaya of Nārāyaṇa, Edited with English translation by Kunhan Raja and S.S. Suryanarayana Sastri, Adyar 1978 (1933) (Adyar Library Series 105).

- Mahāvijayatantra* Śrī Mahāvijaya Vārtikam of Abhinava Gupta. Ed. with notes by Mahāsudana Kaul Śāstri, Srīnagar 1923 (KSTS 31)
- Mahāvijayatantra* Śrī Mahāvijayottara Tantra. By [?] Mahāsudana Kaul, Bombay 1922 (KSTS 37)
- Mṛcchadāmantra* [Nāṛāyana and Yoganāḍi] *Śrī Mṛcchadāmantra* Tantra with the Commentary of Vidyānākanpātha, ed. M.S. Kaul, Delhi: Panini 1982 (KSTS 38)
- Mṛcchadāmantra* [Kṛtyāpāda and Carvāpāda] *Mṛcchadāmantra* (Kṛtyāpāda & Carvāpāda) avec le commentaire de Bhaṭṭa-Nāṛāyaṇakāpa, édition critique par N.R. Bhatt, Pondicherry: Institut Français d'Indologie 1962
- Raksakārikā* — *Asṅaprakaraṇa*
- Vajrayāvalambika* The *Vajrayāvalambika* with the Commentary *Bhāṣākrī* of Viśva-vijyādhīrjaya, Ed. T. Ganapati Sastri, Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal 1982 (The Travancore 1921–22)
- Ratnavāliniparvakti* — *Asṅaparakarma*
- Ratnavāliniparvādhikā* — *Asṅaparakarma*
- Ratnavālinipurna* BHATT (1985)
- Lagunāvalambavijñāna* Śrīmatkāraśāstrīśārasādhyaśāryabhinandanaśāstrīśārasamudbhūta Laghuvijayavāstha [..], Bombay: NSP 1939
- Lingapūraṇa* Lingapūraṇam. Kṛtyāpādivādyāna-maharāṣīrśrīdevayāśa-praṇāna, paṇḍitavāśāryāyāpāricāpanācānakarāṇena saṃpāditam — sakādhikā 1812
- Vijñānabhairavakīyaṇi* *Śrī The Vijñāna-Bhairava* with commentary called *Kuṇḍali* [sic] by Ananda Bhāṭṭa. Ed. with notes by Mukunda Rāma Śāstrī [...], Bombay 1918 (KSTS 9)
- Vijñānabhairavatantri* — *Vijñānabhairavadvayota* and — *ānanda*
- Vijñānabhairavavivṛṇṇādyota* *Śrī The Vijñāna-Bhairava* with commentary partly by Kṛṇḍarāṣī and partly by Śrīvijayādhīrjaya. Ed. with notes by Mukunda Rāma Śāstrī [...], Bombay 1918 (KSTS 8)
- Vijñānāmūrtiparāṇa* *Śrī The Viśnuhātavaratānam*. *kṛṇḍarāṣīśārasādhya* — *sāmpāditā* *śa* *mūṇḍarī* *śa* *kaṭeśvarasūtra* *mūṇḍarāyāna* *prākāśayāna* *pura* *mūṇḍarap*. Delhi: Nag Publishers 1985
- Vivakāśānandhyanakṛtyāna* *Śrī Vivakāśānandhyanakṛtyāna*. Ed. Hari Nārāyaṇa Aṣṭa. Poona 1901 (Anandaśāstrī Series 43)
- Natratnam sūgāra* *Sātarāṇa* *vyagraha* of Uṇṇatīvijayādhīrjaya with an anonymous commentary (*Sātarāṇa* *uṇṇatī* *uṇṇatī*). ed. Pancanan Sastri, Calcutta 1943 (Tāntic Texts XXII)
- Vivādhakā* *Sāradīlīlā* *tantram*, ed. Arthur Avalon, Delhi 1982 [*Calcutta 1933] (Tāntic Text Series XVII)
- Sāraṅgharāṇapaddhanti* *Sāraṅgharāṇa* Paddhanti, ed. Peter Peterson, Delhi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Prasthān 1987
- Śrī śāntavijayārāṇa* *Sivātala* *Rātākāra* of Relsidi Basavādhīrjaya, Vol. III, Ed. P. Marīyavaśaradhya, Mysore. Oriental Research Institute 1965
- Śrī śāntavijayātanta* *Śrī Śāntavijayātanta* *Śrī Śāntavijayātanta* with the *Vivṛ* by Uṇṇatīvijayādhīrjaya. Ed. with Preface & Introduction by Mahāsudana Kaul [..], Srīnagar 1924 (KSTS 54)

- Saṅgahitaṁ* The Śiva Mahātmya. Ed. Puspipendra Kumar, Delhi: Nag Publishers, 1981.
- Saṅgahitāni* — Śaivāsādhanaśāstrāṇi
Saṅgahitāni — Śaivāsādhanaśāstrāṇi of Kṣemajña, ed. J.C. Chatterji, Delhi 1900 (KSTS 10) [Sṅgahar 19 11]
- Saṅgahitānī* Śaivāśāstrāṇi by Upaśya Devāchārya, with the Commentary of Kṣema-
jñā, ed. by Rāi Pramadadāsa Mitrā Bahādūr [...], Benares 1902 (The
Chandrabhāṇa Śaivāśāstrī No. 51, fasc. 1).
- Saṅgahitānībhāṣā* The Śaivaparaṇipāṭa of Śivānugayogin, English Translation S.S. Surya-
das, ed. by R. Balasubrahmaniam and V.K.S.N. Raghavan, Madras 1982
- Saṅgahitānīkāṇṭhā* Samantaparikāśāḥ of Śivānugayogin with Kalhāṇa of Kāllīnātha and
Śaṅkaraśāstrī, ed. by S. Subrahmanya Śaṣṭrī, Vol. III, Adhyāya 5.6
Śaṭṭhāka of Simhaliṅgapaṇḍita, ed. S. Subrahmanya Śaṣṭrī, Vol. III, Adhyāya 5.6
The Aḍyaḥ Loka, 1951 (IAS 5.78)
- Saṅgahitānīśāstrī* — Śaṭṭhātrī
Saṅgahitānīśāstrī — The Śaṭṭhātrīśāstrī of Śāmbha, With The Commentary of Kṣema-
jñā, Ed. by Durgaśāstrī and Kāśīnāth Pāṇḍurang Parab, Bombay: Nirmaya-
Sāgara Press 1889
- Sāṅghatāntarālokaṇī* Sāṅghatāntarālokaṇāgarika. Avec Et Commentaire de Bhāṭa
Rāmākṣaṇa. Edition Critique par N. R. Bhaṭi, Institut Français D'Indologie,
Pondichéry 1979
- Sādhaitrī* (= Āpāṇḍarāśāstrīśāstrī, Īśvarasādhaitrī and Saṁbandhaśāstrīśāstrī) The Sādhaitrī-
yāni and the Pratyabhijñā Karika-Varṇa of Rājanaka Upaśya Deva, Ed. with intro-
ductions by Mahādhvan Kaul Śhastrī [...], Srinagar 1925 (KSTS 34)
- Saṅgahitānībhāṣā* — BACNER-LACHAL-LACHAL (1963), BRUNNER-LACHAL (1977)
- Saṅgahitānībhāṣā* The Śiva Chintāṇī of Bhāṭa Nārāyaṇa With Commentary by
Kṣemajña, Ed. with notes by Mukunda Rāma Śāstrī [...], Srinagar 1918
(KSTS 10)
- Saṅgahitānībhāṣāśāstrī* — Śaivāsādhanaśāstrāṇi
Spaṅdakarāṇī — *Spāṇḍikāśāstrī*
Saṅgahitānībhāṣā The Spāṇḍikāśāstrī of Vasugupta, With the Nirmaya of Kṣemajña, Ed.
[...] by Mahādhvan Kaul Śhastrī, Srinagar 1925 (KSTS 22)
- Saṅgahitānīśāstrī* The Spāṇḍikāśāstrī of Upaśhyachārya, Commentary on the Spāṇ-
ḍikāśāstrī, Edited by Pandita Vinaya Śaṣṭrī of Jāmūnpurkar, Benares: E.J. Lazarus &
Co. 1898 (Vijayagram Sankriti Series, 16)
- Spāṇḍasādhaitrī* The Śaṇḍa Saṅgahita of Kṣemajña, Ed. with notes by Mukunda
Rāma Śāstrī [...], Bombay 1917 (KSTS 16)
- Saṅgahitānībhāṣā* The Svachchanda-Tantra with Commentary by Kṣemajña, Ed.
[...] by Mahādhvan Kaul, 6 vols., Bombay: Nirmaya Sāgara Press 1921-35
With notes by Mahādhvan Kaul, 6 vols., Bombay: Nirmaya Sāgara Press 1921-35
(KSTS 12/38/44/45/51/Vol. V A/53/Vol. V B/36)
- Saṅgahitānībhāṣāśāstrī* The Tantra of Vasugupta, yūpajñāda, With the com-
mentary of Vasugyoti, Edited and translated by Pierre-Sylvain Filholzet, New
Delhi: Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts 1994
- Hariyāyā* The Hariyāyā of Rājānaka Rātināka, With the Commentary of Rājā-
naka Aṅika, ed. Panḍit Durgaśāstrī and Kāśīnāth Pāṇḍurang Parab, Varanasi

Chowkhamba Sanskrit Sanshan 1982 (Kavyamālā 22) (†Bombay: Niraya Sagara Press 1890)

Secondary Literature

- ABHIYANKAR, KASHINATH VASUDEV AND SHUKLA, J.M. (1986) A Dictionary of Sanskrit Grammar. Gackwad's Oriental Series, Oriental Institute, Baroda.
- APTE, VAMAN SHIVARAM (1986) The Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary. Reprinted from the Revised & Enlarged Edition, Poona 1957. Reproduced by Rinsen Book Co., Kyoto.
- APTE, VAMAN SHIVARAM (1983) The Student's English-Sanskrit Dictionary. Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi.
- ARRAJ, WILLIAM JAMES (1988) The Svachhandatantram. History and Structure of Saiva Scripture. Ph.D. thesis, The University of Chicago.
- BHATT, N.R. (ed.) (1985) Rauravagama. Vol. 1. Institut Français D'Indologie, Pondichéry.
- BRUNNER, HÉLENE (1974) Un Tantra du Nord: Le Netra Tantra. *BEFEO* vol. LXI, 125–197.
- BRUNNER, HÉLENE (1985) On the Threefold Classification of Saiva Tantras. In: *Proceedings of the Fifth World Sanskrit Conference, Varanasi, India 1981*, edited by R. N. Dandekar and P. D. Navathe, Rashtriya Sanskrit Sansthan, Delhi.
- BRUNNER, HÉLENE (1986) Le Membres de Śiva. *Asiatische Studien* 40, 189–192.
- BRUNNER, HÉLENE (1992) Jñāna and Kriyā. In: *Ritual and Speculation in Early Tantrism: Studies in Honour of André Padoux*, edited by Teun Goudriaan, pp. 281–312. State University of New York Press, Albany.
- BRUNNER-LACHAUX, HÉLENE (1963) Somaśambhupaddhati. Première Partie. Institut Français D'Indologie, Pondichéry.
- BRIENNER-LACHAUX, HÉLENE (1977) Somaśambhupaddhati. Troisième Partie. Institut Français D'Indologie, Pondichéry.
- BUCHLER, GEORG (1877) Detailed Report of a tour in search of Sanskrit MSS made in Kāśmīr, Rājputāna, and Central India. Journal of the Bombay Branch of the RAS. Extra Number, Bombay.
- BUCHLER, GEORG (1896) Indische Palaeographie. Grundriss der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde. B. I, H. II, Trübner, Strassburg.
- BUCHLER, GEORG (1979) The Laws of Manu. Sacred Books of the East 25, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, [= Oxford 1886].
- DVIVÉDĀ, VAJRAVALLABHA (1983a) Luptāgamasamgraha. Part II, Collected and Edited by Vajravallabha Dvivedi [1]. Yogatantra-granthamālā 10, Sampurnanand Sanskrit Vishva-vidyalaya, Varanasi.
- DVIVÉDĀ, VAJRAVALLABHA (1983b) Upodeśhājñā. [Introduction to] Luptāgamasamgraha. Part II, Collected and Edited by Vajravallabha Dvivedi [1]. Yogatantra-granthamālā 10, Sampurnanand Sanskrit Vishva-vidyalaya, Varanasi.

- DYCKOWSKI, MARK S.G. (1988) The Canon of the Śaivagama and the Kuṅjika Tantras of the Western Kaula Tradition. SUNY series in the Shaiva Traditions of Kashmir, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi.
- DYCKOWSKI, MARK S.G. (1992) The Stanzas on Vibration. The SUNY series in the Shaiva Traditions of Kashmir, State University of New York Press, Albany.
- GNOLI, RANIERO (1959) Var. II secondo capitolo della Śivadgī di Somananda. *RSO* 34, 55–75.
- GNOLI, RANIERO (1972) Luce delle Sacre Scritture (Tantrāloka). A cura di Raniero Gnoli. *Classici della Religione* [...], Le religioni orientali, No. 25, Unione Tipografico Editrice Torinese, Torino.
- GNOLI, RANIERO (1979) Abhinavagupta. Essenza dei Tantra (Tantrasāra). Boringhieri, Torino, 1960.
- GNOLI, RANIERO (1985) Il commento di Abhinavagupta alla Parāṭrimṣkā (Parāṭrimṣkārativivaranam) Traduzione e Testo. Serie Orientale Roma LVIII, IsMEO, Roma.
- GNOLI, RANIERO (1989) La Svabodhodayamañjari. In: Appendix to A. Sironi, La Conoscenza del Iremendo. Milano.
- GONDA, JAN (1976) Vishnuism and Saivism. Mundhum Manoharlal, Delhi.
- GOODALL, DOMINIC (1995) An Edition and Translation of the First Chapters of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha's Commentary on the 'Vidyāpāda' of the Kīrtanagama. Ph.D. thesis, Oxford.
- GOLDRIAAN, TEUN (1985) The Vijnāśikhatantra. Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi.
- GOLDRIAAN, TEUN AND GUPTA, SANJUKTA (1981) Hindu Tantric and Śakta Literature. HIL, Vol. II, Fasc. 2, Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.
- GRIER, JAMES (1988) Lachmann, Bédier and the Bipartite Siemra: Towards a responsible application of the common-error method. *Revue d'Histoire des Textes* 18, 263–277.
- HANSEN, JØRGEN (1998) Śaiva Tantric Material in the *Yogavajraśāstra*. WZKS.
- HOUSMAN, A.E. (1972) The Application of Thought to Textual Criticism. In: *The Classical Papers of A.E. Housman. Collected and Edited by J. Wiggles and F.R. Goss*, vol. III 1915–1936, Cambridge.
- JANERT, KLAUS L. AND POTI, N. NARASIMHAN (1970) Indische und Nepalesische Handschriften. Teil 2. Franz Steiner Verlag, Wiesbaden.
- JHALAKTAKAR, BHIMACĀRYA (1978) Nyāyakośa or Dictionary of Technical Terms of Indian Philosophy. Revised and re-edited by Vasudev Shastri Abhyankar. BORI, Poona.
- KANE, GEORGE (1969) Conjectural Emendation. In: *Medieval Literature and Civilization*, edited by D.A. Pearsall and R.A. Waldron, pp. 153–169, London.
- KÖLVER, BERNHARD (1971) Textkritische und philologische Untersuchungen zur Rājaraṅgī des Kalhaṇa. Franz Steiner Verlag, Wiesbaden.
- KREISSEL, GERD (1986) Die Śiva-Bildwerke der Mithurā-Kunst. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart.
- HEBICH, BRUNO (1920) Zur Einführung in die indische Sprachwissenschaft III. Der Dhātupāṭha. Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung, Heidelberg.

- NIJAS, PAUL (1986) *Textkritik*. B.G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, Leipzig, 2nd edn.
- NIJHART, RIGGIE (1988) *Yaminyacarya's Samvatsāra*. Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien.
- MULLENBUD, GILBERT JAN (1974) *The Mathayamula and its Chel*. Commentary. Chapter 1. II. Introduction, Translation and Notes. E.J. Brill, Leiden.
- PAUL, S. ASHUT (1998) *Vac*. The Concept of the Word in Selected Hindu Tantras. State University of New York Press, Albany.
- PANDIT, KANAK CHANDRA (1963) *Abhinavagupta: An Historical and Philosophical Study*. Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series (Oltre, Varanasi), 2nd edn.
- PAUL, G. G. (1929) *Mats*, *Textkritik* (Review). *Gomant* 5.8.417-435.
- PATEKAR, M. M. (1984) *Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Sri Rishi Sanskrit Research Institute, Junnar*, Vol. 3. Junnar.
- PATTERSON, L. F. (1987) *The Logic of Textual Criticism and the Way of Genius*. In: *Negotiating the Past: The History of Undermining of Medieval Literature*. The University of Wisconsin Press, Madison.
- RAJAGAN, V. (1986) *Abhinavagupta and his Works*. Chowkhamba Oriental Research Studies 20, Chowkhamba Orientalia, Varanasi.
- RAJAGAL, NAVJIVAN (1979) *The Kama Mimeticism of Kashmir: Historical and General Sources*, vol. 1. Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi.
- RAJAGAL, NAVJIVAN (1987) *The Triśatlok of Abhinavagupta with the Commentary of Jayantia*. Ed. by R. C. Dwivedi and Navjivan Rajagal. Vol. 1. Introduction by Navjivan Rajagal. Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi.
- RAJ, WILHELM (1951) *Tamilschriften*. In: *Asien und Afrika*. *Freischrifts-Festschrift* 1. Wehr, pp. 505-513.
- REGER, ROSALE (1985) *Overlapping recessions and the composing process: cell and line interest in the Vidyapavasa*. *JACS* 105.3:531-541.
- SANDERSON, ALEXIS (1985) *Purity and Power Among the Brahmins of Kashmir*. In: *The Category of the Person*, edited by Steven Lukes. Michael Croomer, Steven Lukes, pp. 190-216. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- SANDERSON, ALEXIS (1986) *Mindful and Agnostic: identity in the Tika of Kashmir*. In: *Mindful and Agnostic: Kimsa's (Hinduism)*, pp. 169-214. CNRS.
- SANDERSON, ALEXIS (1987) *Saivism*. In: *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, edited by Mircea Eliade. Macmillan Publishing Company, New York.
- SANDERSON, ALEXIS (1990a) *Saivism and the Tantric Traditions*. In: *The World's Religions: The Religions of Asia*, edited by Friedrich Hardy, pp. 128-172. Routledge, London.
- SANDERSON, ALEXIS (1990b) *The Visualization of the Deities of the Trika*. In: *The Image Divine*, edited by André Padoux, pp. 31-88. Editions du CNRS, Paris.
- SANDERSON, ALEXIS (1992) *The Doctrine of the Mālinīyastotrasāstra*. In: *Ritual and Speculation in early Buddhist studies in honour of André Padoux*, edited by Louis Comblanc, pp. 281-312. State University of New York Press, Albany.
- SANDERSON, ALEXIS (1995) *Meaning in Tantric Ritual*. In: *Essays on the History of Religion*, edited by A. M. Blondiau and K. Schipper, Paris.

- SANDERSON, ALEXIS (1996) *Introduction and Translation*. [forthcoming]
- SANDERSON, ALEXIS (1997) *Introduction and Translation*. [forthcoming]
- SANDERSON, ALEXIS (1998) *The Life of the Ascetics and Lay Smārtas: A Study of the Sankarā Traditions*. Publications of the De Nihili Research Library, Vienna.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (1976) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (1977) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (1978) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (1979) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (1980) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (1981) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (1982) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (1983) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (1984) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (1985) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (1986) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (1987) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (1988) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (1989) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (1990) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (1991) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (1992) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (1993) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (1994) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (1995) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (1996) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (1997) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (1998) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (1999) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (2000) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (2001) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (2002) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (2003) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (2004) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (2005) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (2006) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (2007) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (2008) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (2009) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (2010) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (2011) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (2012) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (2013) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (2014) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (2015) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (2016) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (2017) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (2018) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (2019) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (2020) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (2021) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (2022) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (2023) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (2024) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.
- SHARMA, BRHISHATI (2025) *Iconography of Sadaśiva*. New Delhi.